





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS

052

EN

V.14



Return this book on or before the  
**Latest Date** stamped below.

Theft, mutilation, and underlining of books  
are reasons for disciplinary action and may  
result in dismissal from the University.

University of Illinois Library

JUL -7 1966











THE  
ENGLISH REVIEW.

---

VOL. XIV.

*Sept*  
~~JUNE~~—DECEMBER.



LONDON:  
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,  
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.  
1850.

LONDON :

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,  
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.



052

EN

v. 14

## CONTENTS

OF

No. XXVII.

ART.	PAGE
I.—1. Memoirs of the War of Independence in Hungary. By General Klapka, late Secretary-at-War to the Hungarian Commonwealth, and Commandant of the Fortress of Komorn. Translated from the original manuscript by Otto Wenckstern.	
2. Hungary and the Hungarian Struggle: Three Lectures delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution, &c. &c. By Thomas Grieve Clark (Twenty months resident in Hungary during 1847, 1848, and 1849).....	1
II.—The Expedition for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris, carried on by Order of the British Government, preceded by Geographical and Historical Notices of the Regions situated between the Rivers Nile and Indus; in four volumes, with fourteen Maps and Charts, embellished with ninety-seven Plates and numerous Woodcuts. By Lieutenant-Colonel Chesney, R.A., Commander of the Expedition.....	13
III.—1. The Life of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, Translated and abridged from the German of F. R. Hasse, Professor of Evangelical Theology in the University of Berlin. By the Rev. William Turner, M.A., Vicar of Boxgrove.	
2. The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh. By John William Bowden, M.A. ....	38
IV.—1. In Memoriam.	
2. Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day. A Poem. By Robert Browning.	
3. The Virgin Widow. A Play. By Henry Taylor, Author of "Philip von Artevelde" .....	65

# CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
V.—An Appeal to the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, to combine for the Defence of the Church, and for the Recovery of her Rights and Liberties. By George Anthony Denison, M.A., Vicar of East Brent .....	93
VI. — 1. The Testimony. To the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and others in places of Chief Rule in the Church of Christ throughout the Earth, and to the Emperors, Kings, Sovereign Princes, and Chief Governors over the nations of the Baptized.	
2. Narrative of Events affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole Christian Church.	
3. Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, to all the Kings of the World, to the President of the United States of America, to the Governors of the several States, and to the Rulers and People of all Nations.	
4. Letters exhibiting the most Prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. By Orson Spencer, A.B., President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in Europe. In reply to the Rev. William Crowell, A.M., Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A.	
5. Divine Authority; or, the Question, Was Joseph Smith sent of God? No. I. The Kingdom of God. Nos. II. and III. By Orson Pratt, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.	
6. A Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil.	
7. Absurdities of Immaterialism; or, a Reply to T. W. P. Taylder's Pamphlet, entitled the "Materialism of the Mormons, or Latter Day Saints, Examined and Exposed." By Orson Pratt, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.	
8. Friendly Warnings on the Subject of Mormonism. Addressed to his Parishioners. By a Country Clergyman...	122
VII.—God and Man, being Outlines of Religious and Moral Truth according to Scripture and the Church. By the Rev. Robert Montgomery, M.A., Oxon. ....	150
Notices, &c. ....	176
Foreign and Colonial Intelligence .....	221



# CONTENTS

OF

No. XXVIII.

---

ART.	PAGE
I.—Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses, connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain. By Agnes Strickland. Vol. I. ....	245
II. 1. The Testimony. To the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and others in places of Chief Rule in the Church of Christ throughout the Earth, and to the Emperors, Kings, Sovereign Princes, and Chief Governors over the nations of the Baptized.	
2. Narrative of Events affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole Christian Church.	
3. Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, to all the Kings of the World, to the President of the United States of America, to the Governors of the several States, and to the Rulers and People of all Nations.	
4. Letters exhibiting the most Prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. By Orson Spencer, A.B., President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in Europe. In reply to the Rev. William Crowell, A.M., Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A.	
5. Divine Authority; or, the Question, Was Joseph Smith sent of God? No. I. The Kingdom of God. Nos. II. and III. By Orson Pratt, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.	
6. A Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil.	
7. Absurdities of Immaterialism; or, a Reply to T. W. P. Taylder's Pamphlet, entitled the "Materialism of the Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints, Examined and Exposed."	

# CONTENTS.

ART.	PAGE
By Orson Pratt, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.	
8. Friendly Warnings on the Subject of Mormonism. Addressed to his Parishioners. By a Country Clergyman...	265
III.—The Reformers of the Anglican Church and Mr. Ma-caulay's History of England, second edition. By Chan-celler Harington .....	307
IV.—1. Poems. By Elizabeth Barrett Browning.	
2. The Prophecy of Balaam, The Queen's Choice, and other Poems. By Helen Lowe.	
3. Zareefa, a Tale; and other Poems. By the Author of "Cephalus and Procris," &c." .....	320
V.—The Works of John Jewel, D.D. Bishop of Salisbury. Edited by Richard William Jelf, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Principal of King's College, London; for-merly Fellow of Oriel College .....	334
VI.—1. An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy. By Cardinal Wiseman.	
2. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the New Hierarchy. By George Bowyer, Esq., D.C.L., Barrister at Law, &c. By Authority.	
3. Diotrephes and St. John; on the Claim set up by the Bishop of Rome to exercise Jurisdiction in England and Wales, by erecting therein Episcopal Sees. No. IX. of Occasional Sermons. By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of Westminster.	
4. The Bull of Pope Pius the Ninth, and the Ancient British Church. A Letter. By E. C. Harington, M.A., Chan-celler of the Cathedral Church of Exeter .....	410
VII.—Game Birds and Wild Fowl: their Friends and their Foes. By A. E. Knox, M.A., F.A.S.....	431
Notices, &c. ....	444
Foreign and Colonial Intelligence .....	477

# THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1850.

---

ART. I.—1. *Memoirs of the War of Independence in Hungary.* By GENERAL KLAPKA, late Secretary-at-War to the Hungarian Commonwealth, and Commandant of the Fortress of Komorn. Translated from the original manuscript by OTTO WENCKSTERN. In 2 vols. London: Charles Gilpin. 1850.

2. *Hungary and the Hungarian Struggle: Three Lectures delivered before the Edinburgh Philosophical Institution, &c. &c.* By THOMAS GRIEVE CLARK (Twenty months resident in Hungary during 1847, 1848, and 1849). Edinburgh: James Hogg. London: R. Groombridge and Sons. 1850.

At any other moment than that of the late apparently imminent triumph of democracy throughout Europe, and overthrow of all thrones and time-honoured institutions; when Vienna's self lay, or had but just lain, at the mercy of a triumphant mob; when red republicans were trumpeting far and wide the inauguration of the new era of Equality; at any other moment, we say, the fall of the gallant Hungarian nation beneath the arms of invading Russia would have called forth a burst of indignant execration from the whole of the civilized world; an execration, which would probably not have exhausted itself in cries and groans, but have demanded, and enforced, arms in hand, the just liberties of Hungary, driving back the interloping vassals of the Czar to the boundless steppes of their barbaric territory.

There can be no doubt whatever, that in the main question at issue betwixt the house of Hapsburg and the Hungarian nation, or let us say the Magyars, the latter had right on their side; and that despotic power alone has crushed Hungary, as it once did Poland, almost without a semblance of law or of reason.

We repeat that England, more especially, and the English nation, were prevented from protesting against Russian intervention, and enforcing that protest by arms, mainly, by the almost universal dread of democratic violence, which prevailed throughout the educated classes of this country; and which, for the time being, was even a stronger feeling than our national hatred of despotism and sympathy with freedom: sympathy, let us say, with a bold and gallant nation, defending its hereditary liberties, secured to it by as honoured and as time-worn a charter as our own. We believe, that at a calmer era, England would not have



suffered this oppression of Hungary, one of the oldest constitutional monarchies in Europe, with political institutions bearing the strongest affinity to our own. But the whole "situation" was so complicated and peculiar, that our national sympathies were weakened, nay, well-nigh annihilated for the time; so that the nation, upon the whole, was best content to be a passive looker on, and not to interfere in any of the foreign quarrels betwixt kings and people.

And who that remembers the alarming prospects of that hour can feel surprise at this circumstance? In France, republicanism was triumphant; *red* republicanism seemed near the goal of victory; in Italy almost every ruler, save the King of Naples, had for the time been virtually, or formally, deposed and banished; in Germany most of the minor princes in a body had resolved to abandon their hereditary dominions; Dresden and Berlin had been saved from republican sway only after many days' fighting in the streets, and in the latter city the king had been compelled to throw himself upon the mercy of the mob; even in the capital of civilized autocracy, (for Russia is "*hors de ligne*,") even in Vienna, the old system was overthrown; the revolutionists, arms in their hands, had obtained possession of the city, from which its emperor had fled; in fact, throughout Europe the total overthrow of order appeared imminent, and the supremacy of red republicanism—anarchy of the most fearful nature—appeared to be *the danger* of the time.

Upon the whole, therefore, the educated classes of this country, though they knew that much of oppression was implied in autocratic sway, *desired* to see the democratic movement stayed throughout the world at whatever cost; to have these billows of popular emotion cast back for a while from the rock of authority; and they made up their minds to the infliction of wrong in some particular cases, rather than that all the monarchies of Europe should be crushed by the impending storm.

And *thus* it came to pass, that the Hungarians and the Romans were alike treated with the grossest injustice, and suffered to be thus treated, without any effectual protest from our nation. It was difficult, it seemed impossible, to isolate these cases amidst the general whirl of events, when the first principles of all law and government lay at stake, when crowns were shattering, mobs yelling, blood flowing in streams from fiercest civil strife. At such an hour, what could the Goddess of Freedom do but blush, and stand, her face averted, listing unwillingly to the echoes of such a strife? And perhaps, this attitude best befitted England, as freedom's representative, at that stern hour.

In politics, especially in foreign politics, we rarely seem able to

do that which is positively *best* ; there is no such *best* to find ; we must be contented to choose the lesser of two evils !

The issue of that great struggle was the temporary restoration of order, coupled, almost of necessity, with many minor acts of injustice, the very worst of which, perhaps, was the robbery of those rights and liberties of the Hungarian nation, which they had enjoyed for the last four centuries ; not undisturbed, indeed, but still recognized, on the whole, even by the House of Hapsburg, and gloried in by the Magyar race. Yet we are bound to admit, that the question as between Hungary and Austria was one of a somewhat complicated nature ; and we may as well add, that *our* views upon the subject are *not* derived from the study of the works we have placed at the head of this article, which are productions of an essentially partisan character, and only show one side of every question at issue.

So much, however, is certain : Hungary has enjoyed a free constitution for at least four centuries ; for the last three of which the princes of the House of Hapsburg have been its constitutional sovereigns, much after the fashion in which the Electors of Hanover, despotic in their own hereditary dominions, were the constitutional rulers of this country. The difference betwixt the two cases lay mainly in this : that while Hanover was a petty territory,—insignificant, when compared with the British empire,—the hereditary possessions of the House of Hapsburg, on the other hand, surpassed Hungary in extent and importance. This they could scarcely be said to do in 1549, when Ferdinand of Austria first mounted the Hungarian throne, by virtue of a false and a surreptitious election, not recognized by the nation ; for Hungary had formally chosen another sovereign, John Zapolya, but finally acceded to Ferdinand's election from the dread of a Turkish invasion, which necessarily combined all arms against the infidel.

Gradually the House of Austria prospered, and spread their "stakes" abroad : Austria became a mighty empire ; Hungary, though still an important monarchy, was scarcely competent singly to cope with that empire, though the spirit of its people was never damped ; and her national parliaments continued to meet and make laws, though at somewhat lengthy intervals. It was natural, it was unavoidable, that the House of Hapsburg, reigning in Austria with autocratic sway, should not *willingly* accept the "rôle" of constitutional sovereigns in the neighbour land : they would naturally regard with animosity those institutions which were so utterly opposed to their own Austrian course of procedure ; and their efforts were *sure* to be directed towards the gradual, not overthrow, but rather the desuetude and disuse of those more liberal institutions.

Aristocratic these institutions were, in the highest degree. The Magyars were a conquering race in Hungary; say, some three millions in number: three or four millions more of Wendes or Slaves lived around them, who were regarded and treated as serfs, as conquered races. Again, out of the three millions of Hungarians, only those of noble, or rather, as we should express it, of *gentle blood*, were competent to be electors; but then there were districts in which the whole male population, peasants and all, were counted noble in this sense, so that there were several hundreds of thousands of these citizen-nobles in the country.

There were many abuses *connected with* this order of things, but so far we recognize no abuse; on the contrary, we pronounce this a most admirable form of polity. It is necessary for the liberties of any country that a portion of its citizens only should be entrusted with the suffrage; and that portion should, *if possible*, include representatives of all classes of society, as it did in Hungary. We have omitted to mention, that the chamber of Magnates corresponded precisely with our Upper House, and was formed of exactly similar materials, many of the noblest families in Hungary not possessing what we call the Peerage. The two great evils then existing were, that the class of electors or so-called nobles, though several hundred thousands in number, paid no taxes; and that serfage was allowed to exist almost under its mediæval aspect. The consequence of these institutions however, taken for all in all, was the existence of a free-spirited, noble-hearted aristocracy; not a limited oligarchy, like that of Venice; not a betitled and bedizened class, corresponding to the mock nobility of Germany, with its endless counts and barons; but a large and numerous body of freemen in all classes of society, from the Esterhazies and their fellows downwards; the noblest aristocracy indeed in the world, save that of England's gentry and nobility, and fit to challenge admiration by the latter's side.

They who have lived for years in Austria's capital, as we have done, could not but be struck by the enormous contrast (generally speaking) betwixt the Hungarian gentleman, and the Austrian or German noble. The latter was, at least, in too many cases, a serf in soul, despite his titles and his titular dignities: the former was a freeman! You saw it in his eyes, in his erect head, his bold and easy gait, his frank, manly, pleasant manner of speech. An Englishman's heart must always warm to a true Hungarian: he recognizes his fellow in an instant. We have stood on the race-course at Vienna, among the leaders of Viennese fashion (almost invariably Hungarians), both male and female; and, could we have closed our eyes, we might have supposed ourselves on the grand stand at the Derby: so thoroughly English, in the best



sense, was *the style and manner* of the company there assembled. The Hungarian lady cannot be mistaken for any other than a daughter of the free. Compare her with the languishing Russian "grande dame," or the comparatively heavy and plebeian German fair : and oh, the difference ! Those high and free and open foreheads, those dark and sparkling eyes, that graceful majesty of motion, all proclaim the children of a free-born race ; and the consequence is, that the Englishman, even the stiffest, feels himself comparatively at his ease with them ; he is, as it were, *at home again* ! And this, which is true of Hungary's daughters, holds, as we have indicated, yet more distinctively perhaps of her sons ; the difference is still more marked between these, and the men, the noblemen, of Austria ; for the women of a country generally suffer the least from the servile political institutions which may therein prevail ; these do not come home to *them* ; they feel the chain far less ! A Hungarian gentleman was and is a *gentleman* ; and this says much ! We scarcely know where you will find another such upon the continent. The French marquis of the old school has delightful manners in his way, we grant ; grace, and seeming "bonhomie," and smiling courtesy ; and again, the Italian noble may be impulsive and interesting, and the Spanish grandee magnificent (though we fancy that race has well-nigh passed away), and the German of the higher classes may be polished, well informed, decidedly agreeable ; the German of the far north even bluff and hearty ; but the thorough *gentleman* in tone and manners, as we understand that term, can or could be found, in perfection at least, out of England in Hungary alone.

Of course, there was bitter and continuous warfare betwixt this aristocracy and the House of Hapsburg. Despotism or autocracy always hates aristocracy, and it has ever been its policy to unite, if needful, with the mob against their betters in the social scale. Thus the House of Hapsburg in Hungary has played a partly despotic, and partly democratic game : it has striven to inflame the Wendes and Slaves, the conquered races, against the Magyars ; and again, the peasantry against the nobles ; and finally, "by hook or by crook," as we may say, it has succeeded in its aims ;—it has overthrown the aristocracy of Hungary, and established its own real dominion under partially democratic forms.

From the little we have said, however, it must be abundantly evident to our readers, supposing them to have been previously acquainted with the subject, that this question of internecine warfare betwixt Austria and Hungary was one of an exceedingly complicated character ; nor have we yet mentioned those more peculiar circumstances which enhance the difficulty of arriving

at a really distinct conclusion on this subject. Let us, as briefly as possible, with the omission of all needless dates and details, recount the leading events of the last few years.

As the demand for more liberal institutions in Germany became more and more alarming, the Austrian government became, as of necessity, more and more hostile to the Hungarian constitution, with its parliaments, double houses, open elections, free right of speech, &c. ; it strove, but of course in a great measure, ineffectually to draw the "cordon" tighter betwixt Hungary and Austria, and prevent national intercommunication of thought and action. Thus it was absolutely forbidden to report the Hungarian debates ; and the sale of any MS., or printed document purporting to contain such debates, was punishable, and punished with several years' imprisonment. A "précis" or summary of these debates was forwarded however to the Austrian ministers ; and of this we for some time obtained the perusal at Vienna, and were exceedingly struck with the high tone and spirit of the speakers, both ministerial and opposition : for there were two parties there, as there are in all constitutional states ; one of which was disposed to condemn every measure of the Austrian government, and the other to palliate or defend them. The *liberal* party in that country desired to extend the right of suffrage to the Slaves and Wendes, Croatsians, &c., a step to which the government party, from widely varying motives, was opposed. Those who were officially connected with Austria, and were in fact its creatures (comparatively few), had received their orders from Vienna, and acted accordingly ; for, of course, nothing could be more fatal to the hopes of the Austrian government than that they might ultimately overthrow the Hungarian polity, than to see the national breaches of Hungary all soldered up, and the Slavonian and Magyar races at one. But this *Austrian* party, alone and unsupported, would have been powerless indeed in the free Hungarian chamber of magnates. Many "old Tory" magnates supported and voted with them from natural hereditary aversion to the conquered races : from the love of the past and of the present : they were afraid of the partly despotic and partly democratic tendencies of the "Slave" race ; they feared that the democratic party, comparatively small, among the free Magyars, would be immensely strengthened by this extension of the suffrage to those who were in their eyes unworthy of it.

*Perhaps* this Tory party was wrong, but, at all events, there was a great deal to be advanced in favour of their views : the different Slavonic races combined would numerically outnumber the Magyars, and would, as they believed, be ready, almost at any moment, to surrender up the long cherished liberties of their

country to despotism ; especially to the empire of the Czar, the natural head of all the Slavonic races, a monarch under whom they might hope to become in their turn the conquerors of Europe. Let none of our readers therefore hastily condemn the *obstruction* party in Hungary under the old "régime," though they *were* thus induced to fight under the same banner with Austrian officials, whom they hated. We incline to think that they were wrong, and that Count Szecheny, then the leader of the liberal aristocratic opposition, was in the right ; that amidst the whirl of events around them, the constitution of Hungary *could* not remain "in statu quo;" that it was needful for its lovers and admirers to extend its privileges to others, or to lose all themselves. The risk was no doubt great of entrusting the hostile "Selaves" with power ; but it had become needful, as it seems to us, to run this risk, to avoid a civil war betwixt races, from which Austria and despotism could alone have profited.

Accordingly, by degrees, after long and angry debates extended throughout several years, the liberal party triumphed, despite the "Tories" at home and Austrian influence. Croatia received a constitution ; the Croats became electors ; other real abuses were swept away ; the Magyar nobles even consented to be taxed ; and all seemed to promise fair for Hungary. In time, perhaps, the animosities of races might have died out, and Hungary might have then become one of the noblest kingdoms upon earth.

But now fell the thunderbolt ! Paris gave the signal : the greater part of Europe followed it. Vienna even was in the hands of the mob. At that hour Hungary stood firm to the House of Hapsburg : all its hereditary Tory loyalty burst forth in a clear flame ; it entreated the Emperor to take up his abode at Pesth, where he already reigned in the hearts of his faithful subjects. But Austrian despotism, driven from Vienna, would not seek a dwelling in hated Pesth : Ferdinand fled with his court to the Tyrol. And now began the exhibition of the most hateful system of duplicity to be met with perhaps throughout the annals of history : Stephen, son of the former Archduke Palatine, who for forty years had swayed Hungary as the Austrian viceroy, to the satisfaction of all men, started for Hungary, ostensibly to place himself at the head of the gallant Magyars, and secure order throughout the land, really and truly to strike a death-blow, if possible, *at that very moment*, at the Hungarian constitution ; a constitution almost identified in the thoughts and feelings of the Austrian ministry with their own "red republicans" at home.

Accordingly, secretly, with ever-to-be-execrated perfidy,



Austrian gold was lavishly employed to induce the Croatians to rise against the Magyars, though there was not the slightest shadow of a plea for such injury, the Slavonic races having been at last intrusted with all the constitutional rights and privileges so long withheld from them. Naturally enough, the events of the last two years could not be supposed to have eradicated a hatred of races which had subsisted for centuries: on this the Austrians calculated; a civil war in Hungary, on whatever pretext, was what they aimed at, which might give them an excuse for *intervening* and extinguishing the liberties of that country. This was an audacious policy on their part, adopted when their tenure of power at home was in the highest degree endangered, likely indeed to be taken from them from hour to hour. But the extreme of danger prompts audacity. Where every thing was to be lost, all also, they thought, might be gained; and so it has been for a while! They knew that bewildered Europe, especially France and England, not understanding Hungarian politics, might suppose the question was simply one betwixt monarchy and democracy, and so would stand on one side as spectators, which they actually did. Accordingly, as we have said, they sent spies and emissaries among the Croatians, to stir them to civil warfare, and they found a fitting tool for their vile purposes in a popular idol called Jellachich, a sensual vulgar roysterer, and fool into the bargain, capable of being deluded into the idea that the Magyars were at that moment the Croatians' direst enemies: for, though vanity may have greatly influenced this man, we do not suppose him to have been the mere creature of Austrian titles and Austrian gold. This Jellachich then, Baron Joseph Jellachich (may his name survive for everlasting infamy!), was appointed by the Austrian government, unexpectedly, to the utter surprise of all the world, the Ban of Croatia, a kind of viceroy: they had no right whatever to make this appointment, without the consent of Hungary; but, when it was made, the Hungarian parliament and ministry, with the most unsuspecting confidence, being cajoled by the youthful Stephen, recognized Jellachich at once as Ban. The next step of this Austrian "employé" was to absorb all power in himself, to arrest all opposing magistrates, to talk loudly of liberty and equality, and to proclaim martial law against all men who held any friendly communion with the Magyars. Not satisfied with this, he convoked a so-called "parliament" of his creatures, and actually commenced a civil war, as we have said, without the slightest tangible shadow of a pretext.

And how acted the Austrian government? how the youthful Stephen? Loudly and indignantly they repudiated all the acts of Jellachich: nay, they went further; they declared that he had for-

feited his viceroyalty; they summoned him to lay down arms; they pronounced him a traitor! Secretly, all this while, they were in close communion with him: he was acting throughout, solely and exclusively, by their directions! Will such perfidy be credited by an English reader? But the farce was carried further yet. The Archduke Stephen placed himself at the head of the Hungarian or Magyar army to oppose the invading Jellachich. He departed from Pesth amidst the enthusiastic acclamations of a confiding nation, the most loyal-hearted race on earth. Within a week he had secretly deserted his army, and fled to Vienna, leaving it without a leader, hoping it might then fall an easy prey.

Now at last the eyes of the Magyars were opened: the Austrian creatures, whom they had suffered to head them in the first conflicts, and who had invariably betrayed them, were dismissed, and a Magyar general Moga took their place. A battle ensued, in which Jellachich and his Croats were utterly defeated: he fled, ignominiously deserting his van-guard, ten thousand of whom fell into the hands of the Magyars. However, with his remaining forces, he joined Windischgrätz, and appearing before revolutionized Vienna, reconquered it for the Austrian sway *and the old "régime;"* for as to the bother about constitutional forms, which was then persisted in by the government, we have since learnt to know that this was only "words," and that the House of Hapsburg will stand or fall by autocracy. Meanwhile, will it be believed that the Austrian government, throwing off the mask, had the audacity at this crisis formally to condemn the Magyars for daring to defend themselves against Jellachich; that they commissioned Count Lamberg, an Austrian officer, to dissolve the Hungarian parliament, and further appointed him to the post of commander-in-chief of the Hungarian army? One scarcely knows how to credit such monstrosities.

Then it was that Magyar indignation burst all bounds. Lamberg was torn to pieces on the bridge at Pesth by the mob, he presuming to make a public entrance for the avowed purpose of disarming the nation, and laying them at the feet of their enemies, and this act of popular fury was the signal for the war betwixt Austria and Hungary.

What were the fortunes of this war our readers no doubt already know: we cannot undertake to follow them. For a little while Austria appeared victorious, but then the Magyar nation arose in its strength,—those noble four millions of men; all internal feuds and dissensions were forgotten for a while: under the valorous leaders and generals, who have earned themselves such bloody laurels in this war,—Klapka, Georgey, Bem, Dem-

binsky, Guyon,—the Hungarians were every where victorious, and their far more numerous adversaries were actually driven from the field of conflict. The Austrians altogether evacuated Hungary. Then, at that crisis, an advance on Vienna might have given a totally different termination to the war. But it was not to be: wisely, perhaps, it was ordained, that despotism should triumph rather than democratic anarchy. For, unfortunately, the internal politics of Hungary, under Kossuth's direction, (an enthusiast, but not a practical man,) had assumed more and more of a democratic aspect. A republic—even a democratic republic—was madly proclaimed, owing in no small measure to Polish influence, but mainly, we fear, to the folly of Kossuth. The aristocracy was thereby in a great measure alienated from this popular conflict for life or death: many Hungarians were afraid to fight for their country, when the presumed issue was to be the triumph of the mob, or the dictatorship of the dreamer Kossuth. Thus, too, and thus only, a fair excuse was given to the Austrian government for the calling in of Russian assistance against a democratic and republican, an essentially anti-monarchical movement! That assistance was not refused. How should it be under such circumstances? Austria and Russia's steel-clad legions advanced simultaneously from various quarters on a land torn with internal divisions, with its best and wisest, its *proper* leaders driven from the national councils, and a Kossuth elevated in their stead!

Kossuth seems at this time to have monopolized all power as dictator; as far, that is, as the various generals would obey his orders, which was not often. There was little concerted action among them. Georgey felt an aversion to Kossuth, which he scarcely concealed; perhaps aimed at being himself dictator one day. At all events, all went wrong thenceforth. The Hungarians fought gallantly indeed, perhaps more gallantly than ever: they won one or two more pitched battles; but they were fighting on the retreat, and every day their position grew more difficult. Georgey, from what motives it is difficult to ascertain, unless the mere love of counteracting Kossuth influenced him, (for we do not suspect him, we cannot and will not, of being a predetermined traitor,) placed himself and his "corps d'armée" in the most dangerous position, risking all upon one desperate battle, which he lost; and then he surrendered at discretion, the remaining generals being all, with the exception of Klapka, simultaneously defeated in various quarters. Thus the war was virtually at an end. Klapka still held the fortress of Komorn gallantly, and succeeded, through his moral courage and resolution, in making good terms for himself and his garrison,—and



Hungary lay at Austria's mercy. Many of her best and bravest, including a wise and gallant Batthyani, were mercilessly murdered: and then a calm ensued. The free and ancient monarchy had become a mere province of the Austrian empire: her aristocracy had lost their prerogatives, and almost their existence: the noblest nationality of Europe was to all appearance sacrificed, and despotism was triumphant.

Will Hungary, will the Magyar race, ever arise from the dead? Have they really sacrificed their existence to this phantom of a democracy and democratic republic? Time will show. Our fear is, that this great cause, the cause of national freedom, espoused and represented by one of the noblest aristocracies on earth, has been trampled down for ever and a day by the combined forces of despotism and democracy, by a Kossuth and an Austrian government; and we suspect that the home enemy was the direr foe of the twain! Has not the nation lost all confidence in its *natural leaders*? Are not those who are unwilling to be the serfs of Austria too willing now to hoist the red cap of democracy? If it prove *not* so,—if the ancient institutions and liberties of the nation *can* revive,—we shall rejoice indeed: for, of all our natural allies, the Magyar race is by far the most conspicuous. Constitutional liberty and loyalty have been at once their glory. They were a free and a gallant people, among whom wisdom held sway; not the voice of a single tyrant majority, that direst foe to reason and to right. Not omnipotent amongst them were “the sweet voices” of “the tagrag and bobtail,” which certain politicians regard as the sure dispensers of a millennium. Carlyle, who amidst his wordy nonsense sometimes stumbles upon a truth, may read such men a lesson:—“Do you expect, my friends, that your indispensable aristocracy of talent is to be enlisted straightway by some sort of recruitment aforethought, out of the general population, arranged in supreme regimental order, and set to rule over us? That it will be got sifted, like wheat out of chaff, from the twenty-seven million British subjects, that any ballot-box, reform bill, or other political machine, with force of public opinion never so active on it, is likely to perform the said process of sifting? Would to Heaven that we had a sieve, that we could so much as fancy any kind of sieve, wind-fanners, or ne-plus-ultra of machinery, desirable by man, that would do it!” And again: “Liberty! The true liberty of a man, you would say, consisted in his finding out, or being forced to find out, the right path, and to walk therein. To learn, or to be taught, what work he actually was for; and then by permission, persuasion, and even compulsion, to set about doing of the same. That is his true blessedness, honour, ‘liberty,’ and maximum of well-being: if

liberty be not that, I for one have small care about liberty. You do not allow a palpable madman to leap over precipices; you violate his liberty you that are wiser; and keep him, were it in strait-waistcoats, away from the precipices. Every stupid, every cowardly and foolish man is but a less palpable madman: his true liberty were, that a wiser man, that any and every wiser man could, by brass collars, or in whatever milder or sharper way, lay hold of him when he was going wrong, and order and compel him to go a little righter." Bene dixisti, Carlyle amice! Meanwhile, for lack of a little of such government of the wise, the foolish have ruined poor Hungary, at least for a while: let us trust and pray, not for ever!

We have been led to trace this rapid summary of the internal politics and the late progress of events in Hungary by the perusal of the two works, the titles of which we have placed at the head of our article. Each has its value in its way, though one is dry, and the other somewhat inflated. Mr. Clark's style is ambitious, but his matter is deficient in sound sense, and he is deficient himself in correctness of perception: he sees nothing but what is on the surface, and even that he sees not over well. And yet his little book is animated, and in a measure picturesque; he certainly loves the Hungarian people, well, if not wisely; he has a clever chapter on the past history of Hungary, and he describes amusingly enough what he has witnessed himself. We must only guard our readers against drawing any conclusion from the assertions of so evident a partisan. The gallant Klapka is scarcely as ready with the pen as with the sword. The opening retrospective chapters in his work are exceedingly well written, though they are of course one-sided, and fail to give much needful information; but the rest of the matter is unfortunately dull and dry. And yet, the theme is truly a stirring one, and of course many valuable facts and documents will be discovered in these volumes, from which the future historian must draw his materials in no small part. Indeed, few good libraries should be without these memorials of the hero of Komorn.

And so, we bid adieu for a while to Hungary. Gallant Magyar race, down-trodden and oppressed, our hearts are with thee still! thy time may come, and if it does come, old England will hope and pray, that Hungary may do her duty!

ART. II.—*The Expedition for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris, carried on by Order of the British Government, preceded by Geographical and Historical Notices of the Regions situated between the Rivers Nile and Indus; in four volumes, with fourteen Maps and Charts, embellished with ninety-seven Plates and numerous Woodcuts. By Lieutenant-Colonel CHESNEY, R.A., Commander of the Expedition. (Published by Authority.)* London: Longman and Co. 1850.

SINCE the commencement of the present century, when the Marquis Wellesley, then Governor-General of India, anxiously complained to Mr. Pitt that he was *six months* at a time without intelligence from England, the means by which our communication with the vast Anglo-Eastern Empire could be facilitated, have rightly engaged the serious attention of our most eminent Statesmen, and have on several occasions been the subject of Parliamentary discussion and inquiry.

Indeed it is scarcely possible to overrate the importance of this matter, whether it be viewed in relation to the maintenance of British dominion in the East; to the good government of one hundred millions of British subjects; to the extension of mercantile operations, amongst at least four hundred millions of people, in the richest quarter of the globe; and, above all, as affording a means of facilitating the inculcation of the truths of that Divine Revelation, which first illumining the East, thence shed its bright beams over the Western world, and, by the blessing of God, may now be reflected back on myriads of the human race, who, deprived of its holy radiance, are sunk in idolatry, or barbarized by a pernicious Deism.

For every class of readers, excepting only those whose reading is restricted to the ephemeral literature of the day, these volumes contain a rich fund of instruction, conveyed without pedantry, yet bearing unquestionable evidence of laborious research: the annals of the past have been diligently examined; and the history of the bygone glories of the vast countries between the Indus and the Nile, adds to the deep interest which the graphic account of their present condition is calculated to produce. To enter at length into the merits and convey an adequate idea of the contents of a work in which personal, political, geographical, historical, and commercial considerations are so intimately blended, is scarcely possible within the limits of a



review. Our efforts must, therefore, be restricted to a notice of a few of the leading points of interest, the more especially as the two volumes containing the narrative and proceedings of the author between the years 1829 and 1837 are not yet published.

It is, however, but right to notice the peculiar fitness of the writer for the onerous task he has undertaken. The author belongs to that branch of the military service which has been long distinguished alike by its valour in the field and skill in the pursuits of science. With a well-deserved classical and mathematical reputation, Colonel Chesney naturally sought some sphere for the development of an active mind, other than the monotonous routine of regimental duty at Woolwich; and, while still a junior artillery officer, he availed himself of opportunities of examining the armies of several European Sovereigns, inquiring more especially into the details of that powerful arm—the artillery—on which the decision of all great battles so materially depends. The experience thus derived has been found very valuable, and to some extent it has formed the basis of improvements in our own Ordnance Department.

Colonel Chesney was about to return to England at the termination of hostilities in 1829, after having visited the Russian and Turkish armies in Roumelia, towards the close of that year, when the British ambassador at the Porte, the late Sir Robert Gordon, suggested that a tour, similar to that which had been just made, should be undertaken, for the purpose of ascertaining the state of the other Turkish provinces.

At this period the comparative merits of the proposed lines of communication between Europe and India, viz. by the Euphrates and by the Red Sea, became a question with His Majesty's Government, and Mr. Peacock, then Assistant-Examiner at the India House,—whose far-seeing mind early noted the advantages to be derived from an "overland route,"—recommended an examination of the river Euphrates, for which purpose a list of queries was sent by the Earl of Aberdeen to Mr. Barker, then our Consul-General in Egypt. On arriving at Alexandria, Colonel Chesney was furnished with these queries. The Red Sea was then comparatively little known, and facilities for travelling in Egypt very different from what they are at present. Colonel Chesney devoted every energy to the advancement of the great national objects which His Majesty's Government had in view, and to him belongs the merit of being the pioneer of what is now familiarly known as the "Overland Route to India."

After examining the Isthmus of Suez, he passed down the Red Sea to the port of Kossier; there he debarked, and crossed the Desert to the Nile, which he descended to its embouchure in the



Mediterranean. On arriving there he embarked for Jaffa, proceeded through Palestine, Syria, &c., and, on reaching the Euphrates, descended that mighty stream on a raft made of hurdles, from El-Káyém to its estuary in the Persian Gulf, and prepared a map on a scale of two inches to a mile, showing the depth, current, &c. of the stream, throughout a distance of 701 miles. This was an extraordinary effort, and one requiring no ordinary amount of courage, skill, and persevering exertion, which we hope to find detailed in the volumes yet to be published. An examination of the ruins of Susiana followed the survey of the Lower Euphrates; and the author then journeyed through Persia and Asia Minor, carefully investigating the upper part of the Euphrates, as well as the country lying between its banks and the ports of the Mediterranean. He subsequently prepared a statement of the relative advantages of the routes to India by the Red Sea and by the Euphrates, which was transmitted to His Majesty's Government by Sir Robert Gordon and Sir Stratford Canning, the late and present British Ambassadors at the Porte.

Few but those who have visited the East, and travelled through regions infested by hordes of wandering Arabs, ready to plunder and slay any man, whether Christian, Moslem, or Infidel, can appreciate the value of the services thus rendered, and of the numerous dangers encountered by Colonel Chesney, who travelled with no official authority, and had to rely solely on his scanty pay as a junior artillery officer. He has added to the list of able officers of the army and navy, by whose patriotic zeal glorious services have been conferred on their country, and who have too frequently been left without honour or reward for their meritorious deeds.

The reports of Colonel Chesney led in 1834 to the appointment of a select committee of the House of Commons, to inquire into the means of promoting communication with India by steam. The Earl of Ripon, then Lord Goderich, and Lord Glenelg, then Mr. Chas. Grant, both cabinet ministers, took an active part in the matter; but the chief promoter of this truly national investigation was the late king, who was ever foremost in advancing any cause which had for its object the welfare of his people. And here it may be remarked that His Majesty did not restrict himself to giving merely a general acquiescence to any useful measure; he was pleased in this, as in other instances, to send for the person by whose efforts a matter of vital interest was brought into active discussion; to assure him of the support of His Majesty's Government and of the approbation of the Crown; and like all men of generous minds, to confide full powers to the head which planned and to the hand which was to execute the required or intended

public service. King William the Fourth commanded the attendance of Colonel Chesney at St. James' Palace, and expressed the Royal desire that the route by the Euphrates river and the Persian Gulf should be practically put to the test, more particularly, as His Majesty observed, on account of the manifest advantages which it presented of involving little more than one-half of the length of sea voyage, compared with that of the route by the Red Sea.

The wishes of the king were carried into effect: the committee, after hearing very full evidence respecting the Euphrates, recommended that a grant of 20,000*l.* should be authorized by Parliament to defray the expense of trying the experiment by this route with the least possible delay. The money was immediately voted: two flat-bottomed steamers were constructed by Messrs. Laird of Liverpool, in such a manner as to permit their being taken in pieces on the coast of the Mediterranean, and conveyed, with their boilers, engines, cannon, and stores, on the backs of camels, to the Euphrates, and there re-constructed for the navigation of the river. The author, then Captain Chesney, was appointed under the Royal Sign-Manual, commander of the expedition, with the rank of Colonel "on a particular service;" full instructions were issued by the Duke of Wellington to the Earl of Ellenborough, then President of the Board of Control; naval and military officers, of scientific attainments and repute, and a detachment of skilful workmen from the Royal Artillery and Sappers and Miners were ordered to be attached to the expedition; the permission of the Government of the Sublime Porte was obtained, and His Majesty's ambassador at Constantinople was instructed to afford all possible assistance in the way of representation to the Turkish Government on any occasion where the intervention of that Government with its authority might be required. The King took a warm interest in the preparations for the expedition; every step of the progress was made known to His Majesty through the excellent and lamented Sir Herbert Taylor; and His Majesty was pleased to direct letters to be written to the Ordnance, to the Admiralty, and to other depôts with a view to their hearty furtherance of the objects of the expedition. A week previous to the departure of Colonel Chesney, he was honoured with a private audience of the King, when His Majesty was pleased to issue his royal command in the following encouraging and expressive words:—

"Remember, sir, that the success of England mainly depends upon commerce, and that yours is a peaceable undertaking, provided with the means of opening trade: I do not desire war; but if you should be molested, due support shall not be wanting. You are to write from time to time, through Sir Herbert Taylor, for my information."

The orders given by the Duke of Wellington were precise and full, and his Grace stated that it was His Majesty's pleasure that instructions be issued to the following effect:—

“As the object of the House of Commons in appropriating a large sum of money to be employed by His Majesty for the purposes of this expedition was the promotion of the commerce and general interests of His Majesty's subjects, it will be Colonel Chesney's first duty to use every exertion to secure the success of the expedition in the shortest possible time, and always to bear in mind the necessity of making his arrangements in such a manner as that their utility may be permanent in the event of his success.

“Colonel Chesney will further be careful to maintain the most perfect discipline and subordination among the persons who compose the expedition. He will explain to them that His Majesty will view with the severest displeasure any conduct on their part calculated to defeat the objects of the expedition, whether arising from disagreement among themselves, or from an indifference to the habits and prejudices of the inhabitants of the country in which they are employed.

“It will be the duty of Colonel Chesney, and of every other individual, to conciliate to the utmost of his power the friendship and good will not only of the authorities of the Grand Seignior, but of the different communities and tribes with whom he may have intercourse; to abstain from all acts calculated to rouse the prejudices of the inhabitants; to take no part in any disturbances or quarrels which may exist among adverse tribes; and to avoid all acts of violence, unless in the last extremity, for the preservation of the lives of His Majesty's subjects.

“In short, Colonel Chesney is always to bear in mind that the character of the expedition is one of peace; that it is undertaken with the permission of a friendly power, without whose countenance and co-operation success cannot reasonably be expected; and that having for its object peaceful and beneficial interests, it is only to be conducted by peaceful means.”

The expedition quitted England in February, 1835, and after various unforeseen delays and much sickness, of which eight men died, the two steamers, named the *Euphrates* and *Tigris*, were fairly launched on the Euphrates, and commenced the descent of the river from Bir 16th March, 1836. The objects contemplated were fairly and fully accomplished, as shown in the records of Parliament, and as we hope to have the satisfaction of stating when the two ensuing volumes appear.

It may be necessary to say a few words in explanation of the delay which has taken place in the publication of the work. When Sir John Hobhouse proposed to Colonel Chesney the preparation of a work which would furnish the British nation with a narrative of the events connected with the mission, and



which almost unavoidably involved a geographical and historical sketch of the countries with which the *Euphrates* and *Tigris* have been intimately connected from the earliest times, the author felt that, irrespective of impaired health, (resulting from his long-continued and excessive labours,) his acquirements as a soldier were not exactly calculated to qualify him for so serious a task; but the President having observed that the task most naturally devolved on the commander of the expedition, he expressed his willingness to comply with the wishes of His Majesty's Government to the best of his ability. Literary ambition or personal vanity have had no share in the production of this great work, on which the labour must have been immense. The illustrations, which are numerous and beautiful, were delayed by the artists entrusted with their execution for nearly five years, and only then obtained by the verdict of a court of law; and when this was obtained Colonel Chesney was ordered out to China in command of the Royal Artillery stationed at Hong-Kong. On his return to England on the completion of this service he was ordered to take the command of the Artillery stationed in the South of Ireland, where, notwithstanding his military duties during the recent incipient rebellion, he has completed the geographical and historical account of countries which, to use the language of the author, in the Dedication of his work to the Queen, "were the cradle of the human race, and the theatre of the most important events in the Jewish, Pagan, and early Christian histories."

The subject has lost nothing of its interest by the time which has elapsed. Since the Expedition, which satisfactorily proved the navigability of the *Euphrates* and *Tigris*, and the consequent means of communication afforded by these rivers for rapid transit between India and Europe, nothing has been done to render this remarkable region the highway to the East. The Red Sea, it is true, is traversed, fortnightly throughout the whole year, by steam vessels, and the mails and passengers are regularly conveyed in thirty-five to forty-five days, between London and British India. We have not, however, found any new marts for commerce. The entire line from Suez to Ceylon presents no means of extending our trade; and the long sea voyage and heavy monsoons from Egypt to Calcutta, forbid the possibility of this route being made available for the transit of merchandise. But the case is far otherwise with the route by Syria, Mesopotamia, Armenia, Persia, and the Indus. If those regions were visited monthly by passengers to and from India, commerce must inevitably ensue: the rocks in the bed of the *Euphrates* would be blasted, as has been done so successfully on the Shannon river in Ireland; a canal might be readily cut to avoid the Lamlún marshes below Babylon;

or the ancient canal that still exists between the rivers Tigris and Euphrates be widened to admit the passage of flat-bottomed tug-steamers with tow-boats, such as are now in use on the Ganges, each of which would convey nearly an entire regiment. Bagdad, the city of the Caliphs, would again become the great mercantile emporium of Western Asia. Persia, with its vast resources, would be awakened from lethargy; the rich regions and fertile soil of the territories around Mount Ararat would be an attraction for the exercise of British skill, capital, and industry; and the beautiful valleys of the Lebanon, and the neglected coasts of Tyre and Sidon might ere long become the scenes of a peaceful industry and a thriving commerce, which would spread a civilizing influence over myriads of the human race, now sunk in poverty and indolence.

But we must leave these glowing anticipations, and inform the reader of the contents of the two volumes before us; and this cannot be better done than in the concise language of their author.

“In the first, second, and third chapters of the first, or descriptive volume, the reader will find ample details of the four principal rivers of Western Asia; the soundings, bearings, &c. of two of them, the Euphrates and Tigris, laid down on charts, which, in the case of the former river, extend from Sumeisat to the sea; and in that of the latter, from Mósul to the Persian Gulf. The charts in question, though only on a scale of a quarter of an inch to a mile, will, it is hoped, be sufficient for the purposes of navigation; since it cannot be supposed that, when full information is before the public, two such noble rivers will be allowed to continue to expend their waters without being rendered every year more and more serviceable to mankind.

“I’rán, [Persia,] in its largest sense, and its several provinces, are described in the succeeding chapters from iv to xii. In the last will be found various circumstances which tend to ascertain the primeval seat of the human race.

“Chapters xiii to xvi are devoted to the geography and the social state of Asia Minor. Besides the results of the author’s own travels, he has availed himself of the journeys of others, together with the narratives and descriptions of ancient writers; and the mountain chains have been carefully laid down on the general, or index map.

“Chapters xvii to xxi, inclusive, treat of the climate and productions of Syria, Phœnicia, Palestine, &c.; and, in the same way, those from xxii to xxv describe Arabia, from every available source of information, as well as from personal observations.

“Besides objects of natural history, the Appendix contains a list of the ancient and modern Arab tribes, as far as they could be ascertained; and a copious index will enable the reader to find the various subjects contained in the first volume.

“The author cannot but feel some anxiety about the second volume of the work, the subjects of which deserve to have been placed in more able hands. His first journeys during upwards of three years in the East, opened to him a wide field of inquiry; and on his return, he availed himself of the vast stores of information contained in the British Museum. The extracts there made were found highly useful to the Expedition, when navigating the rivers which flow through lands memorable as the theatre of the great events recorded in sacred and profane history, and traversed by Cyrus, Alexander, Trajan, and Julian, as well as by the most renowned of the Muslim leaders.

“The stirring events which, in ancient and modern times, are more frequently connected with the Euphrates than, perhaps, with any other part of the world, seem to be the first which require attention. In attempting this task, the author had the assistance of Mr. Rassam, the principal interpreter of the Expedition, for Arabic researches; and afterwards that of the very learned and industrious Aloys Sprenger, M. D., who, being both an oriental and a classical scholar, was of the greatest service. During these researches, the resources of the British Museum, of the Bodleian at Oxford, and of the vast library at Paris, were turned to account; and the fifteen chapters, beginning with the dispersion of mankind and ending with the establishment of the Turkish power in Europe, have been the result.

“In Chapters xvi and xvii the author has endeavoured to show the connexion at different periods between Asia and Europe, with respect to literature and science. The eighteenth chapter is devoted to ancient and modern commerce. The nineteenth describes the architecture, sculpture, &c. of I’rán; and the twentieth, the boats and hydraulic works of the East.

“In the volumes now introduced to public notice, authorities will be found for every statement which has been made; and in some instances, circumstances have been confirmed by quotations from other writers, even though they have come within the author’s knowledge.”

Whatever may have been the labours of other geographers, there can be no doubt that we owe to Colonel Chesney a most finished and elaborate survey<sup>1</sup> of the greater part of the plateau of Central Asia, and of the numerous streams which flow from the mountain chains of Armenia, Kurdestân, and Asia Minor—countries which have long been a sealed book to European inquir-

<sup>1</sup> The numerous and extensive maps which accompany these volumes are—like every thing else undertaken by this accurate writer—complete; and the public are now in possession of a more perfect delineation of the Euphrates, and of its adjacent shores, than that of any other river of equal magnitude. The map of Arabia is very valuable in conjunction with the list of Arab tribes, and their military strength of horse and foot. The expense attending the preparation of these maps must have been very great; indeed, we hear that the work has already cost upwards of 5000*l.*, and of this but a small part has been defrayed by Her Majesty’s Government. It is to be hoped, however, that the author will at least be indemnified against any pecuniary loss by his meritorious labours.



ers, although their history presents the most remarkable facts to be found in the wide field of ethnological science.

To the biblical student engaged in tracing in the history of past nations, the fulfilment of the prophecies of Holy Writ, the investigations of the learned and religiously-minded author, will be found fraught with interest. The researches in these volumes concerning the position of the Garden of Eden; the condition of the land in which the fathers of the human race sojourned; the dispersion of mankind on the plain of Shinar; the state of Arabia in the time of Lot and Abraham; the Jewish, Assyrian, and Egyptian histories; the fall of Babylon, and the site of Nineveh—are highly instructive, and calculated to strengthen and enlighten any mind alive to the importance of these subjects. True it is that the inspired volume was written to teach us things of deeper and more enduring value, than the geography or history of the countries or the nations therein mentioned; but it does, nevertheless, impart to us knowledge even on those points of which, without its testimony, we should have been utterly ignorant. We know, indeed, and blessed be God for the knowledge, that the saving truths of our religion are so plain, that “he who runs may read;” yet are we not the less sure that it has pleased God that the highest intellectual faculties given to man, should find healthy and invigorating exercise in tracing the history of his race, and striving, with humble zeal, to establish, by documentary and positive evidence, the accuracy of biblical narrative. The extraordinary success with which such efforts have been crowned, especially in the present day, afford indisputable evidence that in the moral, as well as in the material world, our Creator hath not left Himself without a witness; the marvellous prescience traced in the latter by such men as Ray and Paley, is but the counterpart of that which in the former, through the researches of Keith, Chesney, Layard, and others, has been so wonderfully permitted to be manifested:—and as surely as the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth His handy work, so surely does the all-seeing Governor of the Universe, in His dealings with His responsible creatures, mark with indelible traces the retributive justice which it has pleased Him to award to those nations who, despising His commands, have suffered the inevitable penalty of their crimes.

Our space will not permit us to do justice to the merits of the really extraordinary work before us, but we must attempt to place before the reader a few extracts, with a view rather to afford a specimen of the nature of its contents, than to select the more remarkable and interesting details, for which we must refer to the work itself.

The introductory part of the work which is comprised in the two volumes now published, was undertaken by the author under the direction of persons in authority. He engaged to "execute the work in accordance with the outline then approved of; which was, that the account of the voyage should be preceded by a geographical and historical sketch of the countries with which the rivers Euphrates and Tigris have been intimately connected from the earliest times."

Different notions will be entertained as to the meaning of the word "sketch," and we should conceive it possible that there may not have been any original intention of so elaborate and so extensive a survey, as that for which we are indebted to Colonel Chesney. And while we are bound to testify our admiration of the labour and research which have been bestowed on these portions of his work, and our sense of the great value of their results, we must add an expression of apprehension, that to the general reader the great length to which the work is extended may, in some degree, operate as an impediment. To ourselves, we confess that the notion of a "sketch" would have conveyed a different notion from that which it seems to have done to Colonel Chesney; yet we must admit, that taking into account the great variety of objects touched on—the details of ancient and modern geography of the most interesting half of Asia, including almost every subject in connexion with the politics, commerce, manners, scenery, and remains of antiquity, the work *is*, after all, only an outline or sketch.

Although this be the case, Colonel Chesney has executed his work in no superficial way. Every page bears ample evidence of research in its margin, which teems with reference to all works, both ancient and modern, bearing on his subject. And, in truth, while we turn over his learned and yet unpretending pages, and the many interesting and well-executed illustrations which adorn them, we are forcibly arrested at each step of our progress, by reminiscences and associations, such as we have seldom experienced from the perusal of a work dedicated to such purposes as that before us. Not only is the field over which we are taken of the highest interest in reference to its present state and condition, but at each page, even of the geographical volume, is dropped some word which recalls forcibly to the mind the glories and the ruin of ancient empires; or the fortunes of the Christian Church in her most illustrious period:—"Antioch," "Babylon," "Nineveh," "Prusa," "Smyrna," "Ecbatana," "Mecca," "Trebizond," "Seleucia," "Palmyra," "Cæsarea," "Susa," "Jerusalem"—are words of power, evoking the shades of buried ages, and peopling those desert lands with the pomp and pride of mighty

empire, the arts of civilization, the busy toils of commerce and agriculture, the intellectual strivings of the learned and the wise, and the progress and reverses of religion; and, above all, revealing the awful purposes and dealings of God with man. But independently of the historical interest of these lands, the monuments of ancient art and civilization still remaining, promise to present an inexhaustible fund of interest to the antiquarian and the chronologer. The remarkable discoveries at Nineveh may probably lead to still more interesting results as they are continued; and how many other buried cities still remain to reward the toil and perseverance of their excavators?

Nor are these countries, though impoverished and degraded beneath the sway of unenlightened governments, without interest even in their present state to the politician, and the merchant, more especially if the object of Colonel Chesney's Expedition should be ultimately carried out.

The geographical part of this work commences with a general account of the extensive basins forming the principal water-courses of Western Asia. These are four in number, and are described in the following terms:—

“The elevated plateau which extends from the base of Mount Ararat into Northern Armenia, Kurdistan, and part of Asia Minor, contains the sources of four noble rivers, having their estuaries in three different seas; and thus from Armenia, as from the centre of a great continent, giving an easy communication to the several nations of Europe and Asia. A reference to the index map will show that by following the Kizil-Irmak through Asia Minor we reach the Black Sea; from whence there are inlets to Russia, Austria, Turkey, &c. In the same way the Aras, by terminating in the Caspian, opens several routes towards Great Tartary, as well as towards the rest of Central Asia and China; while the Tigris and Euphrates, with their numerous ramifications, afford abundant means of communicating with Persia, India, Arabia, and the continent of Africa. An extensive mercantile intercourse is also maintained with the same regions by means of numerous caravans, which since the time of Abraham, at least, have traversed the countries watered by these four rivers.”—i. 3.

It appears, however, that the Kizil-Irmak, which debouches into the Black Sea, is not likely to be as useful in aiding communication. “It is not available,” says Colonel Chesney, “for the purposes of navigation, in consequence of the rapids which occur in passing through the several chains of mountains, the Kirk Delim, Kush Tagh, Al Goz, and Ada Teppeh; as well as from the existence of volcanic rocks in its bed at certain places.” It appears also that the Aras, or Araxes, which rises in the same central plateau, and after a course of 830 miles enters the



Caspian, is like the Kizil-Irmak, interrupted by rapids, and even cataracts. These two rivers appear to afford no means of water carriage to any extent.

As regards the Tigris, the third of these rivers, we are informed by Colonel Chesney, that it still bears the scriptural appellation of "Hiddekel" amongst a large proportion of the people living on its banks; and it appears to be comparatively free from obstacles to navigation. We here become acquainted with the ancient contrivances for irrigation—the dykes or bunds, several of which are still in existence, more or less perfect, and are of profound antiquity. They were a kind of dam across the river for the purpose of raising the water so far as to fill certain canals and cuts made for the purpose of irrigation. These have, through the neglect of the government, been permitted to fall to decay; but in one instance, Colonel Chesney mentions the effect produced by irrigation, where the ancient system has been in some degree kept up.

"Just below Sammara, on the opposite bank, is the bed of the Dujail, or Little Tigris. This cut, according to Abu-l-feda, went from thence and watered the land near Baghdad. It was met with in several places during the examinations of Dr. Ross; but owing to the neglect, so prevalent under Moslem governments in the present day, the dike, or bund of the entrance, has fallen into a state of decay; therefore, instead of constituting an abundant supply, the water carried along this channel only occupies a small part of the ancient bed, and this to a moderate depth. This cut takes a south-east direction through cultivated lands, where its effects, even in its present diminished state, are most striking in fertilizing the grounds and fruit gardens surrounding the villages; this is particularly the case near the prosperous village of Sumeichah, situated about seventeen miles south-east from the commencement of the canal. Here irrigation has changed a tract which was previously barren, into one possessing the fertility ascribed to this region by Herodotus, whose account has too often been placed amongst the legends of fiction, by those who make the produce of ordinary countries a standard for estimating that of Mesopotamia."—i. 28, 29.

The Tigris is navigable even now by rafts at certain seasons from Diyar-Bekr to Mosul, close to the site of Nineveh, a distance of about 300 miles. Below Mosul it is so more or less throughout the whole year, and the passage to Baghdad is so easy and so rapid, that the river is known by the name of "the cheap camelier." The ordinary mode of transit appears to be by means of rafts, supported by inflated skins. A raft of this description is mentioned by Colonel Chesney, which was constructed in 1781, to convey the Right Hon. John Sullivan from Mosul to Baghdad, and which was supported by 200 skins, and had on it a small

cabin. These inflated skins of animals are also used by the natives to cross the river, and Colonel Chesney has given us an amusing representation of two of these turbaned and bearded personages, each bestriding a pig-skin, and beginning the passage.

Amongst other still more ancient remains, the Tigris passes near the ruins of those once famous and imperial cities, Seleucia and Ctesiphon, the capitals of the Seleucidæ, and subsequently of the Parthian and Persian monarchs, whose power so severely tasked the energies of Rome in the height of their vigour, and in their decline. These now desolate ruins were on more than one occasion the scene of triumphant procession and rejoicings at the defeat of the Romans, and more especially after the destruction of the army of Crassus. A majestic building of great dimensions, called the "Arch of Chosroes," marks the site of Ctesiphon; and judging from the drawing in Colonel Chesney's work, we should suppose it must have formed a portion of an imperial palace rather than of a triumphal arch. It appears to be something of the dimensions of a good-sized cathedral, and, in point of fact, might be taken for a portion of one. We should suppose that in this vicinity excavations might bring to light many objects of interest.

The Tigris becomes considerably swollen during the rains in the month of November; it subsequently decreases and swells at intervals, until the different tributaries are bound up by the frost of January in the mountains of Kurdistan. It rises again about the middle of March, and is highest about May, when its velocity is 7.33 feet per second. It then falls more or less regularly till the middle of June.

"The large boats are not, however, obliged to diminish their cargoes till the month of August; between which time and the month of November, when the river is again at the lowest, they should not draw more than four feet of water. There is an active commerce along the Tigris, between Basrah and Baghdad, by means of the large country boats which go in fleets; and above the latter city it takes place chiefly by means of rafts to Mosul."—i. 39.

The fourth great river which rises in Armenia is the Euphrates, which forms the chief subject in the work before us. Its source is at no great distance from the Euxine, and in its course to the Indian Ocean it approaches very near to the Mediterranean—at one point to within 120 miles, so that a land journey of that moderate amount, and a subsequent river navigation of about 1100 miles, would take the traveller from the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf. The fall from Bir to the mouth of the river (1117 miles) is very trifling, being only at the rate of six inches per mile; the Danube, between Ulm and Passau, having an average fall of two or three feet per mile. At the ruins of

Balis, the Barbalissus of the ancient Romans, and once the port of the ancient Beroe, the distance to the mouth of the Euphrates is only about 1030 miles, while the shore of the Mediterranean is distant only 123 miles in the direction through Aleppo to Suweidiyeh, and 118 through Aleppo to Iskanderun, being not much more than *half* the distance of the land carriage between Alexandria and Suez by Cairo.

In speaking of one of the tributaries of the Euphrates, Colonel Chesney gives the following interesting account of the remains of Al-Kadhr, on the authority of Dr. Ross:—

“The ruins are a mile in diameter, and are inclosed by a circular wall of very massive construction, with towers at intervals; the whole is surrounded by a deep ditch, and there are the remains of a mound, also circular, beyond it. In the centre of the town stands the principal object of curiosity; a range of buildings inclosed by a strong wall, square in the plan, and similar in construction to that of the city; the faces are opposite the four cardinal points, and each measures 300 paces in length inside. The buildings consist of spacious halls and chambers, covered by semicircular vaults, some of which rise to the height of sixty feet from the ground; and on the pilasters there are figures in relief, apparently Greek or Roman. The whole city is built of a brownish grey limestone, the blocks of which are so closely fitted that no cement is visible.”—i. 50, 51.

When one reads of cities standing thus perfect after the lapse of 2000 years, the thought occurs, how few of our modern architectural efforts seem destined to a similar endurance. There seems to be much beautiful scenery on some parts of the Euphrates: at Karablah, where the river is obstructed by a ledge of rocks, which constitute the greatest difficulty experienced by boats from Bir to Basrah, the picturesque beauty of the scene appears to be considerable, the hills at one side being crowned by a walled town, while a little lower the houses of another town open to view among thick date groves, the river itself bearing a series of islands, and the ruins of the ancient Anatho appearing in the distance. Below this spot the course of the river lies amongst partially wooded hills, affording good pasture. Villages appear occasionally surrounded by cultivation; and numerous ancient aqueducts, in different directions, prove that in former times a wealthy and a civilized people inhabited this portion of the country. The famous bituminous fountains of Hit are in this neighbourhood, and boats coated with bitumen are still in use.

Having thus partially followed Colonel Chesney in his account of the four great rivers which take their rise in Armenia, we are led to direct attention to the views which he connects with them in attempting to fix the site of the Garden of Eden. That there are difficulties connected with Colonel Chesney's exposition of the



well-known passage in Genesis we feel, but we must say that his view appears to us far more probable than the ordinary one, which supposes Eden to have been in Babylonia. Colonel Chesney supposes it to have been in Armenia, in the elevated plateau to the north of Kurdistan. He observes that there is but little to guide the inquirer in his investigations, except the very brief description contained in the book of Genesis; and the difficulty is increased by the probability that the designations of locality given in Scripture must be traced amongst languages different from that of the Pentateuch, and amongst nations who took possession of the tracts about the Black and the Caspian Seas after those tracts had ceased to be called by their original names. Under such difficulties, it might at first sight appear almost hopeless to determine the site of Eden; but many indications connected with the character and natural productions of the country, which presented themselves in the course of Colonel Chesney's extensive researches in that part of the world, led to the formation of an opinion which he thus states:—

“From these, and from the fact that the sources of the Euphrates and Tigris, and of two other great rivers, exist within a very circumscribed place in Armenia, I have been led to infer that the rivers known by the comparatively modern names of Halys and Araxes, are those which, in the book of Genesis, have the names of Pison and Gihon; and that the country within the former is the land of Havilah, whilst that which borders upon the latter is the still more remarkable territory of Cush.”—i. 267.

It is a fact of some weight, that there is a tradition firmly believed in the valleys of Central Armenia, that the tract allotted to our first parents, or “as the Hebrew expresses it, the Paradise in Eden towards the East” (Gen. ii. 8), included the northern portion of the Pachalik of Mosul, extending from this part of Assyria to a little to the north of Erz-Rum; the western border being in the vicinity of Tokat, in the direction of the Halys; and the eastern including some portion of the district beyond Lake Van. Within the limits of this extensive and fertile tract of country are the mountain ranges of Ararat and Nimrud, forming parts of the vast chain of the Taurus; and it is certainly a remarkable fact, that in the great plateau round Mount Ararat, within ninety miles from a common centre, there are the sources of four noble rivers, of which two at least clearly bear the names given to the rivers of Paradise in the Bible. We must quote the whole passage.

“And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.

“And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of

life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

“And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads.

“The name of the first is Pison: that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good: there is bdellium and the onyx-stone.

“And the name of the second river is Gihon: the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia.

“And the name of the third river is Hiddekel: that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates.”—Gen. ii. 8—14.

On this passage we have the following remarks:—

“We are told,” says Colonel Chesney,” that a river (or rivers, for the original word has both a singular and a plural signification) went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. The name of the first is Pison, and the name of the second is Gihon.”—i. 268.

Of the passage referred to, the following is given as a literal translation: “And a river (or rivers) went out from Eden, to water the garden: thence it (or they) spread out; that is, had four heads;” and it is observed that the words “went out” must be equivalent to “rose in;” for as the garden was planted in Eden (Gen. ii. 8), the river need not flow out from Eden in order to water it: the words signify to spread or dissipate, but not divide; and it is argued that the succeeding verses show that there were four distinct rivers corresponding with the four heads, as their names are given.

After these preliminary criticisms, the author enters on his task, which as regards the Tigris and Euphrates is an easy one. As for the Tigris, it still bears in many places the name of Hiddekel, Dekel, Dijel, or Diglath. The word “Tigris” in the Median tongue signifies “arrow,” and is given to the river where it becomes rapid. The great difficulty regards the Pison and Gihon, and the lands of Havilah and Ethiopia, those names being now unknown. The Pison is supposed by Colonel Chesney to be the same as the Halys or Alys, the Eksios of the Armenians, which under the appellation of the Kizil-Irmak encompasses a large part of Asia Minor. The Pison is said in the Bible to “compass” the land of “Havilah.” So that we have to make out that the part of Asia Minor thus compassed by the Alys answers the description given by Moses.

Now with respect to “the land of Havilah, more correctly Chavilah, Reland, after much pains and research, concludes that it coincides with the Colchis of the ancients.” *If* this be a

correct conclusion, it identifies the Havilah of Scripture with the country included by the Halys ; but we are not furnished with the data on which it is based. But a more valuable fact is, that in this district, westward of the Euphrates and towards the Halys, there exists at this present day a town or village called *Haivali*, very much like "Havilah" in sound, and that "gold is found" here (i. 276). There is also a district in that neighbourhood called Chalva or Chavata, which is very like "Chavilah" or "Havilah ;" and it is ingeniously argued, that the fable of the "Golden fleece" in Colchis, is an indication of the abundance of the precious metals in that district in early times. It is also capable of proof from history, that gold abounded in that region in after-ages. As to the "bdellium" mentioned by Moses, there are considerable differences of interpretation amongst commentators, some supposing it to mean a kind of gum, others, a precious stone. In either case, however, it appears that the natural productions of this country meet the description ; "emeralds," and "pearls," which are understood by some writers to be designated by "bdellium," being found in Colchis and the neighbouring district ; and the gum supposed to be indicated, being also found in quantities, as well as turquois, beryl, and *the onyx*.—i. 279, 280.

We now come to the "Gihon," and the land of "Ethiopia ;" or, more properly, "Cush," compassed by it. The Gihon is supposed by Colonel Chesney to be the same as the Araxes or Aras, which flows into the Caspian, and encompasses a land which he identifies with the "Cush" of Scripture. It is stated, but we do not see on what authority, that the descendants of Ham occupied this country (i. 275). The country, however, appears to be sufficiently identified in the following passage, which seems to us to make out the point sufficiently :—

"This territory, which was bounded on the north by the Araxes or Gihon, and which constituted the Cossea of the Greek and Latin writers, was the abode of the posterity of Nimrod up to the time of the Jewish historian, who says of the sons of Ham, 'time has not at all affected the name of Chus ; for the Ethiopians over whom he reigned are to this day, both by themselves and by all the men in Asia, called Chushites.' . . . On the Nahr-Madcha, a little way north of Babel, are the ruins of the Kush of Abu-l-fedā ; a name which seems to be quite as ancient as the former city, and from whence and its neighbourhood the inhabitants were transported by Shalmanazar to Samaria. The word Chus remains almost unchanged in Kush, Shus, Sus, and Kushasdan, the land of the sun, and the land of the magi. It is also repeatedly mentioned in close connexion with the territory lying northward and north-eastward of Babylonia . . . That Asiatic Cush has been rightly placed in the territory adjoining Colchis, seems tolerably clear from some of the old writers. Hieronymus says, that



Andrew, brother of Simon Peter, preached near the rivers Apsanes and Phasis, where are the inner Ethiopians . . . . Moses Choronensis is even more explicit; for he not only indicates the early locality of the sons of Cush, but likewise their possessions eastward of Persia proper, the latter being known as Kusdi Khorasan, whilst the former kingdom was called Kusdi Nimrud. Moreover, the Armenians call the Persians, and all the Hunnish tribes within the Caspian gates, Kushanians; and the whole tract eastward of the sources of the Araxes or Gihon, is expressly called Ethiopia by a remarkable Hebrew traveller; the well-known Benjamin of Tudela, who visited this part of the world in the twelfth century, and not only took notice of the territory of Cush, but likewise of the river Gihon."—i. 281, 282.

The evidence as to the river Aras having been called "Gihon" is, it must be confessed, rather feeble. Reland and others suppose this word to be derived from roots either in Hebrew or Armenian which signify impetuous speed, a description which well accords with the nature of the stream. This perhaps is not a very strong argument. An Armenian historian also is quoted, who states expressly that the name of the river Gihon was changed to Araxes by a king of Armenia, after his son. This may possibly be so; but as Colonel Chesney does not inform us when this author lived, or how far we may depend on his testimony, the argument appears defective. On the whole, however, we think there is a very high degree of probability that the view taken by Colonel Chesney is correct, and the facts he has collected are valuable, though we cannot say that they are arranged in very lucid order.

The country through which the expedition passed, is wonderfully rich in remains of antiquity of various ages. Take the following description of Halebi near the Euphrates, a ruined town once connected with Palmyra:—

"Twenty-six miles short of the eastern limits of the Pashalik, which are at the town of Deci, and on the slope of a hill rising abruptly from the right bank of the river, is Halebi or Zelebi. This striking place is fortified with walls and towers, which, as well as the public and private buildings, are constructed of fine gypsum. The town has the form of an acute triangle, whose base rests upon the river, whilst its sides ascend the steep acclivity of a conical hill, and terminate on its summit with a small acropolis. As the whole is completely seen from the exterior, the necessity of an increased number of flanking towers became very apparent: twelve of these works defend the southern side, and eight the northern or shorter side; whilst on that of the river, which is not commanded, they are further apart. In the town are the remains of a temple, and an extensive palace containing many ornamental apartments; also numerous well-constructed private dwellings, supported by arches; and in general the buildings are so well preserved,

that the mind can scarcely be brought to feel that all have been so long unoccupied. The city of Zenobia (Halebi) was probably built by the queen of that name, and resorted to by her at certain seasons, in order that she might enjoy the refreshing breezes which are felt along the valley of the Euphrates. It also appears to have been the principal passage leading from Palmyra into Assyria; for a little below the walls, and opposite the ruined castles of Halebi on the left side, are the remains of an embankment, partly arched with bricks fifteen or sixteen inches square, but chiefly of solid stone.

"Like the great city on which it was dependent, the necropolis occupies a prominent situation in the valley and along the declivity of the hill westward of the town, and it is remarkable for a number of square towers, precisely of the same construction as those near Palmyra. The monuments of mortality usually consist of three stories, the lowest and middle appear to have been tenements of the dead, whilst the upper story served as a place of defence, and terminated either with a flat or a pyramidal roof, surrounded by battlements. In one of these tombs Captain Lynch recently discovered a female mummy, whose face was covered with a thin mask of the finest gold, which is to be seen at the India House; and in another tomb is an inscription which was copied by Mr. Ainsworth."—i. 418, 419.

The remains at Antioch are in some respects among the most interesting in the East. Colonel Chesney gives the following details of their present state:—

"Scarcely a vestige remains of that portion of ancient Antioch which, according to Pliny, must have occupied the northern banks of the Orontes. Walls and square towers of surprising solidity encircled the residence of the Syrian monarchs, the seat of pleasure, the centre of extensive commerce, and the third city of the habitable earth. The southern portion of Riblatha or Hamath the Great, occupied a singular and most striking position. This part of the city was bounded on the south-east by a high range of rocky hills, and on the opposite or north-western side, by the valley of the Orontes; whilst deep precipitous valleys formed its north-western and south-eastern limits. The walls have a circumference of nearly seven miles, and form an irregular parallelogram, with one of its longer sides touching the Orontes, and the other crowning the summits of the heights above-mentioned . . . .

"Near the western extremity of the city a portion of the walls has been razed to build the barracks and serai of Ibrahim Pasha; but from thence along the Orontes to St. Paul's gate, as well as on the rest of the circumference (about seven miles), the limestone walls and towers are remarkable for their superior construction."

In the lower part of the city no particular skill was requisite to provide the requisite defences, but in the higher and precipitous parts, great skill in construction has been shown. Walls have been carried sometimes up almost perpendicular cliffs, and in many places up acclivities so steep, that the wall becomes a

series of steep steps, defended at intervals by castles which ascend above it, so as to protect its defenders from assailants; the wall itself being throughout from fifty to sixty feet high, and eight to ten feet wide at the top. These castles remain so far perfect, that their staircases, and vaulted and loop-holed chambers and cisterns, are still apparently in much the same state as when they were occupied by a Roman garrison.

The second volume of Colonel Chesney's work is chiefly historical; and it comprises a condensed account of the eastern world from the Flood to the present day, including a survey of the spread of the human race after the dispersion. We fear Colonel Chesney has been led to attach too much weight to the opinions of the late Mr. Bellamy in this part of his work. He appears to refer to Mr. Bellamy's translation of the Bible as of authority. Now we apprehend that this writer was a Unitarian; and under such guidance an event which is usually and rightly considered miraculous—the confusion of tongues at Babel—becomes merely the arrival of another nation speaking a different language. The translation here propounded by Mr. Bellamy, in opposition to that which is universally received as the real meaning, appears to us most absurd in several respects, and we regret that Colonel Chesney should have been led to depend on so untrustworthy a guide. We regret to observe the same author followed elsewhere, as, *e.g.* ii. 69, where the sin of Lot's daughters is explained away. But in saying this, we must add, that Colonel Chesney's tone of mind is not to be inferred from such accidental mistakes. On the contrary, it is eminently believing, and he refers for the most part to the authorized translation, and without any attempt to explain away the miraculous and other facts recorded in it.

It would be impossible to follow Colonel Chesney through the wide range of his subjects in this volume, in which he writes on the history, religion, philosophy, commerce, and arts of the ancient world. From all that we have seen he appears to have bestowed extraordinary and most exemplary pains in accumulating materials from all quarters, and condensing them into a connected narrative. We must however find space for a few more extracts.

The following remarks on the architectural remains of Mesopotamia and Assyria are interesting:—

“Since architectural remains are justly considered good criterions of the social state of the people by whom the works were constructed, those of Mesopotamia and Assyria, which go back to the period of the Noachian deluge, must possess considerable interest. On approaching the site of one of the primeval cities, the attention is attracted by what at first appears to be a natural conical hill of considerable size, which however proves to be the mouldering remnant of a vast building. Such a mound could not fail to be remarkable in any situation; but, rising



out of an apparently boundless plain, in a transparent atmosphere, the effect which it produces in the mind is most striking. The celebrated plains of Dura offer few other remains of antiquity ; and none which can be compared, in magnitude or in extent, to these gigantic masses, which have been formed by the ruins of some of the greatest works ever executed by man, and which now serve only to guide the traveller on his way.

“ The alluvial district of Babylonia being without stone, it was necessary to resort to other materials for the construction of public and private works ; and, as clay existed in abundance, bricks were the materials chiefly employed by the builders of that country. But it is owing to the pyramidal shape of the edifices, rather than to any peculiar qualities of the materials, that these monuments of early art still exist.

“ The Babylonian bricks were of two kinds : one kind consisted of such as are burnt in a kiln ; the other, and by much the larger proportion, being simply dried by being exposed to the sun. The former vary in size from 11 inches to  $13\frac{1}{2}$  inches square, and they are  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches deep ; they are sometimes, however, much smaller, and they are of various colours : the bricks are chiefly cemented with common clay, but in the quays the foundation, and exterior parts of the structures that once adorned this mighty city, bitumen appears to have been extensively used. One face of each brick had on it an inscription, and sometimes a figure, and in some instances it is also glazed and vitrified ; and this face was placed downwards ; the cement is usually found adhering to the upper surface.

“ The second, which is an inferior kind, is rather larger than those which had been kiln-dried, being nearly  $4\frac{1}{4}$  inches deep, and from  $11\frac{1}{4}$  to 14 inches square ; the larger ones weigh 38 pounds 11 ounces avoirdupois, and were formed of the pure clay of the country, rendered more tenacious by being mixed with a little sand, and some coarse straw or fine reeds. Those bricks when dried by exposure to a powerful sun, soon became sufficiently hard, and gave the means of rapidly raising a large structure which in so dry a climate was exceedingly durable.”—pp. 604, 605.

We have the following remarkable account of ruins to the north of Persepolis :—

“ On an eminence in the plain of Nungh'-áb, about fifty miles north-east of Persepolis, numerous remains mark the site of a very extensive city ; on which it is evident that much skill and art had been bestowed in order to render it worthy of being the seat of empire. The most remarkable portion of these ruins, the Mesjid-i-Maderi-Suleimán (the Mother of Solomon), has a grand pedestal, composed of immense blocks of white marble, on a base 43 feet long and 39 feet broad, and rising in six tiers or gigantic steps to the platform of the monument, which is at the height of 26 feet 9 inches from the ground. The walls of this Sarcophagus itself consist of four layers of large stones ; and the exterior dimensions of this structure are 20 feet 6 inches long, by 17 feet 2 inches wide, and 11 feet high to the cornice ; it

is covered with a solid roof, whose exterior is arched. This entrance is in the north-western end; and above it are the marks of a tablet. The chamber is 10 feet 10 inches long, by 6 feet 10½ inches wide, and 6 feet 10½ inches high; it has a flat roof, and a stone floor, each composed of two great slabs of marble joined in the middle. On the wall facing the south-west, has been cut in later times an ornamental window, with an Arabic inscription. The pedestals of 24 columns placed around at 14 feet apart, with scattered fragments of their shafts, mark an area of 400 square feet; which at one time enclosed what is now ascertained to have been the tomb of Cyrus. The plain of Nugh'-âb is moreover strewn with ruins, some of which have arrow-headed inscriptions; but, as a whole, these remains are far inferior to those which constitute the ruins of Persepolis."

We have the following remarks on the ruins of Persepolis:—

"In glancing over these elaborate specimens of early art at Persepolis, the first place must be given to the excavations: a spacious niche, sculptured in the face of the rock, 130 feet high, and 72 feet wide, forms the façade of the principal tomb, which is in two portions, both highly finished. The upper compartment represents a kind of chest, having numerous figures sculptured on it; also a fine altar, with a figure standing in the act of adoration, and an attendant spirit hovering above. A false door forms part of the sculpture of this second division, and through its lower part a passage has been broken into the tomb itself.

"The other objects of antiquity are in front of the tomb; and a general idea of these remains may be conveyed to the reader by observing that they occupy different parts of a grand terrace, which forms a very irregular parallelogram at the foot of a stupendous range of rocks. On the eastern side, the terrace is nearly 1600 feet long, and three of the sides are surrounded by massive walls, having in each a number of breaks or indentions forming right angles; but the direct distances from side to side are respectively, 1540 feet for the western face, 893 feet for the northern, and for the southern face 703 feet.

"This terrace is approached near the northern extremity of its western side, by means of the double flights of steps, which are separated by a landing-place 37 feet long by 24 feet wide; and so gradual is the ascent, that it is suited for horsemen. It is constructed with such ponderous blocks of marble, that each piece contains several steps 17 feet long by 18 inches broad, and 3 inches deep, and the pieces are so neatly formed, that the whole has the appearance of having been cut out of the solid rock. A little way from the top of this grand approach, the road leads through two gigantic portals; and there are yet standing two of the four great columns, which once occupied the space between the two entrances: their heights are 39 feet and 28 feet respectively. The front and interior sides of the first portal are supported by two huge unicorns, 14½ feet high; and those of the second, by two winged animals, each having the head of a man, which is covered with a kind of cap: the unicorns are in front of the grand staircase, and the other animals are towards the mountains."—pp. 618—620.

On the subject of the navigation of the Euphrates—a subject perhaps now of less urgent importance than when the Expedition under Colonel Chesney was sent out—but still an important and interesting subject, the author writes as follows:—

“Previously to transferring the Euphrates steamer to the Bombay Government, in accordance with the original plan of the Expedition, reports stating the practicability of navigating the river Euphrates were sent to the Home Government from the late Commander Cleveland, R.N., from Mr. now Commander Charlewood, R.N., and Mr. now Captain Fitzjames, R.N.; also from Captain, now Lieutenant-Colonel Estcourt, M.P., and Mr. Ainsworth; and the opinions expressed in these reports were speedily confirmed by the ascent of Lieutenant, now Commander, Charles D. Campbell, I.N. (one of the officers serving under Commander Lynch) to Beles, the port of Aleppo, which, by the air-line, is only an hundred miles from Iskenderûn. The rivers of Mesopotamia also had been thoroughly explored, and every thing promised the permanency of an establishment in those regions when the services of the steamers, Assyria, Nimrûd, and Nitocris, were required to assist in the operations on the Indus.

“It is to be hoped that the inopportune check thus given to the progress of steam navigation in Mesopotamia will be removed; and that the day is not very far distant when other and more suitable vessels will be employed. A cheap and rapid communication with India may then be maintained by this route, and at the same time a considerable increase would accrue to the commerce of Great Britain.

“Without entering upon the subject at length, it may be sufficient to observe that small vessels of light draught, such as can now be constructed, will not experience any serious difficulties in carrying the Indian mail from the Persian Gulf to Beles, whence they could be transported through Aleppo, Iskenderûn, Trieste, &c., to England. The transit would be accomplished in twenty-five days from the Gulf, or thirty-one days from Bombay. The mails from India might be brought by this route alternately with the Red Sea Line, according to the original intention.”—pp. 600, 601.

We have said that the subject of the Euphrates navigation is of somewhat less importance than it was in 1835, fifteen years ago, when the Euphrates expedition was carried into effect, because the facilities for the overland journey by Suez have been much increased in the course of that time. By that route the journey from and to India is now accomplished, on an average, in about six weeks, or forty days. According to the foregoing statement of Colonel Chesney, the passage from Bombay to Beles on the Euphrates (about 100 miles from the Mediterranean) would occupy thirty-one days. In this we may add two or three for the land journey, unless a railroad were constructed; and then we apprehend the sea voyage would be rather longer



than from Alexandria. So that, on the whole, we apprehend there would be no gain in point of time by the Euphrates route, except, perhaps, in going out to India, when the passage, in consequence of descending the Euphrates, would be somewhat less.

Judging from the reports of the Officers in the Appendix of the second volume, it would seem that there are actually difficulties of no trifling description in the navigation of the Euphrates. We refer to the Karablah rocks, over which there is only three feet water in the low season, with a stream running seven miles an hour, and where a vessel would require to be warped up the stream. The Lamum marshes also present a serious difficulty, the river being, for a space of twenty-five miles, so much lost in these marshes and in various branches, that the main stream in the dry season has not above thirty inches water in some places, besides being extremely difficult to navigate, in consequence of the abrupt and sudden windings of its course. The practical inconvenience resulting from this would be, that goods and passengers would have to be transferred to three different steamers on their passage from Bombay to Beles on the Upper Euphrates; a large steamer taking them from Bombay to Basrah, a very small one through the marshes, and a larger again on to Beles. Of course this difficulty could be got over by blasting the rocks at Karablah, (which probably could be easily done,) and by cutting a canal for twenty-three miles through the marshes. This latter operation would be attended, we presume, with no inconsiderable expense; but if the design were carried out, we should think the best course would be to accept the offer made by the Pasha of Baghdad, (if it should be repeated,) to dig a canal connecting the Euphrates and Tigris, and thus avoid the Lamum marshes: were this done, the only great difficulty of the navigation would be got over.

We confess, however, that our nerves are rather shaken by the kind of preparation which Captain Fitzjames recommends in his communication; for we peaceful civilians do not exactly relish the kind of reception we should be likely to meet amongst a people who, we are told, "would certainly take advantage of the vessels, and attack them if they imagined they were in a defenceless state" (p. 693); and when Captain Fitzjames seriously recommends, that the steamers employed in the passage down the Euphrates should have "*at least* one swivel gun forward or aft, as *convenient*, to fire grape and canister, with four one-pounder swivels, and two wall-pieces; a good portion of muskets or carbines, pistols, swords, &c. for the crew, and if *Congreve rockets* could be kept from spoiling by the carriage or heat, a supply would be *invaluable*" (p. 693); we own, that with all the anxiety we feel to visit Mesopotamia, we cannot help shrugging our

shoulders, and feeling just as well pleased that we are not in one of the Euphrates steamers at this moment. We should beg leave to send Colonel Chesney, and his gallant associates, to *clear the way* for us in the first instance, and we have no doubt that were the "swivel" and the "Congreve rockets" brought actively into play for about half a dozen voyages or so, back and forwards, not forgetting the "wall-pieces," "carbines," &c., a considerable alteration would take place in the views and practices of the "bad set" of Lamlum and its neighbourhood; and of other persons of predatory habits. But under existing circumstances, as the steamers would have to "lie to" *every night*, we should not exactly relish the chance of finding some night our throats being cut by a party of Bedouins, or Mesopotamians. We protest, therefore, that nothing shall induce us to take our passage in the Euphrates steamer until Colonel Chesney shall have executed a *razzia* or two on the natives, with the energy of which we are sure he is capable; and shall have taught them to know the meaning of the word "Congreve" by experimental application. In the language of his friend Captain Fitzjames, we have no doubt the rockets would be "invaluable!"

We are sure Colonel Chesney will pardon us for joking a little over this matter. We must take leave of him with a smile, tendering to him our best thanks for the really noble work he has produced—for the extensive research which constitutes it a perfect Encyclopædia on all subjects connected with Oriental geography and history, and certainly a work full of more varied interest than any book treating on Oriental subjects that we remember to have perused.

We are, seriously speaking, of opinion, that the Euphrates navigation *ought* to be tried again, notwithstanding the "swivels" and "Congreve rockets;" and that there are no insurmountable difficulties in the way. We would urge it especially on the ground of the great advantages to British trade and commerce, which are likely to ensue from throwing open the whole of Western Asia to our mercantile enterprize; and in concluding our remarks, we would only add the expression of our surprise in finding that promises of brevet rank, and of payment of expenses, were held out to Colonel Chesney when going out on his expedition which have never been realized. We think such a fact most discreditable to the various governments of the last fifteen years; and trust, most earnestly, that so great and long-continued an injustice will be at once remedied. It may be that the country has not derived from the expedition the practical benefit which was anticipated; but this is surely no reason for withholding from an excellent and most meritorious officer, the promised reward of services which he has faithfully performed.

ART. III.—1. *The Life of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury. Translated and abridged from the German of F. R. HASSE, Professor of Evangelical Theology in the University of Berlin. By the Rev. WILLIAM TURNER, M.A., Vicar of Boxgrove.* London : Rivingtons.

2. *The Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh.* By JOHN WILLIAM BOWDEN, M.A. In 2 vols. London : Rivingtons.

SEVEN centuries have passed over the English Church since the great struggle in the days of Anselm and Becket ; and now, in the mysterious cycle of Divine providence, we are again involved in much the same questions, and surrounded by many of the same circumstances, which, at that remote period, so keenly exercised the faculties, and aroused the passions, of our forefathers. The question of the nineteenth century is, like that of the twelfth, Whether the spirit of the world—the spirit of the age, is, or is not, to convert the Christian Church into one of its instruments ; to imbue it wholly with its own earthly spirit, and tendencies, and objects ; to extinguish its witnessing in behalf of Christ against the world, and the flesh, and the devil.—It may not be unprofitable in the present times, to review the course of events, in many respects so strangely similar, in which the Church found herself involved seven or eight centuries ago, inasmuch as it may tend to show, that as great dangers and difficulties as those we have to contend with have been the lot of our predecessors in times when the spirit of the age was untainted by the presence of speculative infidelity ; and may also supply various practical lessons and suggestions in reference to the mode in which the contest between the world and the Church should be conducted in the present age.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, then, the Western Church generally found itself in the closest possible union with the State ; a union which had existed for centuries, and which gave to the temporal sovereigns a control over ecclesiastical affairs scarcely inferior to that which was established in England in the time of Henry VIII., and which still in theory subsists amongst us. For three hundred years or more, *i. e.* from the time of Charlemagne, the bishops of the West had been possessed of princely and baronial power and rank ; the synods of the Church had become



parliaments, in which ecclesiastical and temporal affairs were discussed and regulated by the king and nobles as well as by the bishops and clergy; the popes, metropolitans, bishops, abbots, and other prelates, were, either directly or virtually, appointed by the temporal sovereigns. In every direction, the emperors and princes were in full possession of a supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs, guaranteed by ancient precedent, recognized by the Church and its highest authorities in former ages, and established by temporal law.

Had the State employed this supremacy with a due regard to the welfare of the Church, its rights would never have been disputed. The emperors would have continued to nominate the popes and the rest of the hierarchy. The fearful wars which for ages ravaged Europe, dethroned so many sovereigns, and ended in exalting the papacy above all the sovereigns of the West, would never have taken place. The sovereigns of England, in particular, would not have been involved in an unsuccessful struggle with the leaders of the Church party in their own dominions, nor been deprived, as they were for ages, by law, of all their higher ecclesiastical patronage. Every thing would have gone on smoothly and in perfect harmony between Church and State, if the State would have honestly and fairly fulfilled the duties which it assumed in taking on itself the ecclesiastical supremacy.

But this course, unhappily, was not pursued by the emperors and other sovereigns of Europe. They treated the Church as if it had been a department of the State. Its bishoprics became the rewards of royal favourites, or were abandoned to the principal vassals of the crown, in the hopes of strengthening the throne by thus subsidizing them out of Church property. The spiritual interests of the Church were wholly neglected. Piety, learning, orthodoxy, were set aside, to make room for birth, influence, or wealth. The State acted on merely secular and worldly principles in its dealings with the Church, making it subservient to the promotion of its temporal objects. And this went on for centuries, during which a general darkness overspread the Church. Its discipline sank into desuetude; its religion became either worldly or superstitious; its prelates became secular lords, the servants of the State, and not of the Church; theological learning became extinct.

Such were the results arising from the influence of the State upon the Church in those ages: the Church property alone was left, and the traditions of the faith; but that great body lay as it were without a soul for many years.

In the middle of the eleventh century, at length, a reforming party arose in the Church,—not amongst the rulers of the Church,

or amongst the laity, but amongst the inferior clergy ; which, though small in number at first, and of little power, was supported in its opposition to the gross tyranny and wickedness of the State by the weight of undeniable facts, and plain and palpable justice. It brought against the established abuses of the State's ecclesiastical supremacy the principle of religious obligation. And although the State was supported by an obsequious hierarchy, a proud and jealous peerage, and a vast body of other adherents ; and the Church party had to contend with adverse laws, adverse precedents, a hostile episcopate, most awe-stricken by the temporal power, and deeply tainted by simony ; yet, nevertheless, such was the force of truth, and the effect of the State's ungodliness in all Church matters, that this little party found leaders, whose stern and high-souled energies lifted the see of Rome, round which they rallied, above all the monarchs of the West ; and the State not only lost, through its own corruption, the power which it had so long exercised in ecclesiastical affairs, but was obliged to yield to the temporal dominion of the Church.

At the era of the Reformation, the Crown of England, after various preparatory efforts in preceding ages, shook off the jurisdiction of the papacy, which was half spiritual and half temporal, and resumed the powers which the Christian emperors and princes formerly possessed. Henry VIII. obtained the same ample powers in ecclesiastical matters which Charlemagne and his successors held : nor did the Church offer any opposition to the exercise of these powers by Henry and his successors. Amidst various anomalies, and actions in themselves questionable,—as regarded strict regularity,—amidst various excesses of the Royal power in ecclesiastical matters, the Church felt that this great object of her existence was looked to by the State. She saw an anxiety to promote her spiritual welfare ; her bishoprics sedulously filled by learned, pious, and zealous divines ; her synods in full action ; her discipline enforced ; her opponents discouraged and repressed. Time passed on, and a change came over the State : the Church had become a tool in its hands for the promotion of its temporal objects. It ran precisely the same career which the temporal power in the West pursued for two hundred and fifty years before the time of Hildebrand. At length the proceedings of the State have been gradually becoming intolerable. A party has arisen in the Church which is at present in the minority, but which is strong in argument against the gross and unchristian abuses of the State's power over the Church. As before, the State has law on its side, old possession, precedents, patronage, a compliant and timid episcopate, a baronage jealous of Church liberties, and a host of adherents of all kinds. As before, those

who oppose State corruptions, and assert the inalienable rights of the kingdom of God, are regarded as seditious and dangerous men, are discountenanced by the episcopate, and are in bad odour with the world.

Nevertheless it is plain that their movements will have results : whether they move or not, there are certainly great events and changes before us. Circumstances will raise up more powerful leaders than they now possess. Their cause will gain ground as discussion goes on, for they have a mass of monstrous and indefensible corruptions to expose, and their claims are founded in plain and palpable justice. They must, therefore, become each year increasingly formidable ; they can appeal to the deepest-seated religious principle, to the sense of common justice and fairness implanted in our nature, to the breach of compacts and pledges, to the natural desire for liberty. The State is endeavouring to suppress this awakened spirit, but it will not succeed. What will be the course of events it is impossible to foretell with any certainty : but, in any event, the State will be severely punished for its unprincipled conduct. It will probably, eventually, lose all control over the Church ; and thus the present fears of statesmen may be realized through their own mistaken policy. This may happen, even if the State should have in the mean time confiscated the Church's property : for any such proceeding might not diminish the strength of the Church ; it might, under certain circumstances, largely augment it. If Parliament were to take away all Church property now, we are inclined to think the Church of England would soon be far the most powerful political body in the country, and would be able to do pretty much what she liked in politics.

The State might have prevented any such movement on behalf of the Church's liberties, by abstaining from acts which are really injurious to the Church, and by a right use of its ecclesiastical patronage. It might still, we believe, arrest the current of events, by doing its duty to the Church, even at the eleventh hour. But the temper of statesmen and their adherents is evidently very far from any wish to remove opposition by concession or conciliation. They persuade themselves that all opposition will speedily die away of itself, or else they are resolved to act unflinchingly, on a policy of repression and discouragement, in the vain hope of putting down a party which they regard with aversion. Such appears to be their fixed course of policy ; and therefore we think that the contest must go on continually increasing in strength, with every fresh opportunity of collision afforded by the progress of events. The Hampden controversy was one point in this contest. The Gorham case has afforded



another field. Such cases will arise frequently. The two which have arisen have wrought an immense change in the Church's mind towards the State, and have created an organized movement. A few more steps of the same kind will increase that movement's power to an incalculable extent.

We must now revert to the history of the Western Church from the time of Charlemagne.

According to Gieseler (ii. 21), the sovereigns of the Carolingian dynasty "retained the general superintendence of the Church," which they exercised by means of royal visitors or envoys, who, under the title of "*Missi Dominici*," held regular visitations of the bishops, clergy, and monks, and inquired into their moral conduct and the discharge of their duties. These sovereigns also possessed "the right of arbitration in Church matters," and directed appeals to be made to themselves from the decisions of the metropolitans. They assembled synods at pleasure, and possessed "the direction and confirmation of all ecclesiastical decrees." The decisions and canons of councils were required to be confirmed by them before they could be put in force. "Though Charlemagne wished to introduce again the election of bishops by the clergy, they still continued for the most part to be appointed by the king." The royal envoys attended at elections, and their nomination was equivalent to a "*Letter Missive*" in the present day. These sovereigns "allowed no interference" to the pope "in the affairs of their own Church, but by argument or persuasion."

Mosheim remarks, (*Cent. VIII. part ii. ch. 2.*) that at this time,

"The supreme dominion over the Church and its possessions was vested in the emperors and kings, both in the Eastern and Western world. The sovereignty of the Grecian Emperors in this respect has never been contested; and though the partizans of the Roman pontiffs endeavoured to render dubious the supremacy of the Latin monarchs over the Church, yet this supremacy is too manifest to be disputed by such as have considered the matter attentively; and it is acknowledged by the wisest and most candid writers even of the Romish communion. Adrian I., in a council of Bishops assembled at Rome, conferred upon Charlemagne and his successors the right of election to the see of Rome; and though neither Charlemagne nor his son Louis, were willing to exercise this power in all its extent, by naming and creating the pontiff at every vacancy, yet they reserved the right of approving and confirming the person that was elected to that high dignity by the priests and people; nor was the consecration of the elected pontiff of the least validity, unless performed in the presence of the emperor's ambassadors. The Roman pontiffs obeyed the laws of the emperors, received their judicial decisions as of indis-

pensable obligation, and executed them with the utmost punctuality and submission. The kings of the Franks appointed extraordinary judges, whom they called envoys, to inspect into the lives and manners of the clergy, superior and inferior, to take cognizance of their contests, to terminate their disputes, to enact laws concerning the public worship, and to punish the crimes of the sacred order, as well as those of the other citizens."

Mosheim remarks, in addition :

"It is further to be observed, that the power of convening councils and the right of presiding in them, were the prerogatives of the emperors and sovereign princes, in whose dominions these assemblies were held ; and that no decrees of any council obtained the force of laws until they were approved and confirmed by the supreme magistrate."

The above statements represent to us a union of Church and State quite as intimate as any that has ever existed in England. This was the system which existed for ages in the West, and which might have continued without interruption had it not been extremely abused. We must adduce one more testimony, from the well written life of Anselm, by Professor Hasse, of Berlin, for a translation of which we are indebted to the Rev. W. Turner.

"Since all the political relations of the Germans rested on territorial possessions, the Church, by her richness in these possessions, early acquired an important authority in the State. And as she was chiefly indebted to the kings for these possessions, and relied on their protection for their preservation, they became the patrons of the Churches ; and the bishops, as stewards of ecclesiastical property, stood in a corresponding relation to the kings, as the vassals and functionaries, the 'people' of the same, whose temporal possessions originated with them, and to whom they formed a kind of spiritual nobility. . . . The kings sought in them a counterpoise against the temporal peers, and in order to gain their attachment, conferred on them the highest political privileges, the so-called regalia, and made over to them whole counties in imperial fee, so that, subsequently, they were able to exercise sovereign sway in Germany. Thus the Church obtained an influence in public life which she never before possessed ; for she not only exercised temporal authority over a great part of the country, and in her own territories, but gave her concurrence, in all general questions of government, even to the possession of the throne. She maintained her seat and voice in the Imperial Diet, and besides, enjoyed all the rights which remained to her from the time of the Romans,—a right of inspection over morals and discipline, a peculiar administration of justice, the guardianship of orphans, &c. But, on the other hand, this worldly position brought her into greater dependence on the State than before ; for whilst her dignitaries were persons of such importance

in the State, and in whose conduct kings were deeply interested, the latter strove to ensure their devotion to their service, and *for this end, above all endeavoured to acquire the power of distributing ecclesiastical honours*. The Church willingly acknowledged that such important offices should not be conferred without consent of the king, and expressly subjected the legality of episcopal elections to his approval, so that he had the right of recommendation to every see which he founded. \* Thus the old canonical form of election 'by Clergy and people' fell into desuetude, although in theory its freedom was supposed to exist, and it was even legally restored by the kings from time to time; but in practice the right of recommendation and confirmation had passed into a formal right of nomination. On the notice of the vacancy of an episcopal see, the king expressly ordered who should fill it, and merely allowed the form of an election, or, without regard to it, wrote at once to the metropolitan to consecrate the person whom he had designated. And since this nomination was at the same time an induction into the possession and privileges of the see, it gradually assumed the character of an investiture, especially when the bishops acquired temporal fiefs of the empire; and although this investiture referred to the property and rights, and not to the duties of the see, yet there was so little distinction between them that the act of investiture was at the same time a delivery of the signs of office, of spiritual office—the ring and the crosier; so that the power of the Church actually appeared to flow from that of the State, and the more so, as consecration followed investiture."—pp. 50—53.

In the foregoing description of the union of Church and State previously to, and subsequent to, the time of Charlemagne, many features will recal to the reader's mind the power of the Crown over the Church of England since the Reformation, and as we see it in the present day. Here is the very same system of State supremacy. In both cases it was introduced with the consent or submission of the Church. In both cases it was enforced by law; was one of the most highly prized branches of the royal prerogative, and existed for centuries.

Now, then, we proceed to trace the state of things in the Church under this royal supremacy of the Carlovingian, and other sovereigns in those ages.

Mosheim remarks on the ninth century:—

"In the Western provinces the bishops were become voluptuous and effeminate to a very high degree. They passed their lives amidst the splendour of courts and the pleasures of a luxurious indolence, which corrupted their taste, extinguished their zeal, and rendered them incapable of performing the solemn duties of their function; while the inferior clergy were sunk in licentiousness. . . . Besides, the ignorance of the sacred order was, in many places, so deplorable, that few of them could either read or write."—(Cent. ix. p. ii. c. 2.)



Of the state of the Church in the tenth century, Mosheim speaks in the following terms:—

“Besides the reproach of the grossest ignorance which the Latin Clergy in this century so justly deserved, they were also chargeable in a very heinous degree with two other odious and enormous vices, even concubinage and simony, which the greatest part of the writers of these unhappy times acknowledge and deplore. As to the first of these vices, it was practised too openly to admit of any doubt. . . . The other vice above-mentioned reigned with an equal degree of impudence and licentiousness. The *election of bishops and abbots was no longer made according to the laws of the Church*; but *kings and princes, or their ministers and favourites, either conferred these ecclesiastical dignities upon their friends and creatures, or sold them, without shame, to the highest bidder.* Thus it happened, that the most stupid and flagitious wretches were frequently advanced to the most important stations in the Church; and that, upon several occasions, even soldiers, civil magistrates, counts, and such like persons, were, by a strange metamorphosis, converted into bishops and abbots.”—(Cent. x. p. ii. c. 2.)

Of course, under such a system of appointment to the higher ecclesiastical offices, the most fearful evils must have become prevalent in the Church. We need not wonder, therefore, at the almost universal ignorance and immorality. But who was to blame for these evils? The State only. The Church had yielded up to the sovereigns of Europe the general superintendence of the ecclesiastical matters, and especially the appointment of bishops. The sovereigns, instead of regarding that patronage as a sacred trust for the benefit of religion, set aside all religious considerations, and dealt with ecclesiastical patronage as if it were merely secular.

The corruption of the Church, and especially of the episcopal order, in those ages, is also represented by Gieseler (ii. 98); and amongst other results of the general secularization of the Church was the virtual cessation of synods, which gradually merged in parliaments.

“Since,” says Hasse, “the bishops had been attracted to the Imperial Diets, they were accustomed to discuss these ecclesiastical concerns; consequently synods were more unfrequently held, and, when they did take place, they had an entirely juridical aspect, *i. e.* the temporal peers attended, and the approbation of the king was not only required for the assembly, but also for the measures under consideration, and the conclusions received their validity from his sanction. Yet *the nobles felt too little interest in spiritual affairs to attempt to influence the decisions concerning them.* Doctrine, worship, &c., were not interfered with. Their worst influence referred to the persons who had the administration of these things; for *in the appointment of Church*

*dignitaries, their attention was chiefly directed to their own political or local interests; nor did they so much regard the spiritual qualifications of the candidates, as the family, name, or party to which they belonged; and if these points came not into consideration, the decision turned upon the sum which was offered to supply the pecuniary wants of the nobleman or his adviser. The most disgraceful simony was practised, to the increasing degradation of the Clergy; for the prelates, in order to remunerate themselves for the price of their own dignities, made the disposal of the lowest offices in the Church a continual source of profit to themselves.*"—*Life of Anselm*, p. 54.

We might easily multiply references to works of authority in further proof of the prejudicial influence exercised on the Church by the State in those ages; but it seems needless to supply additional evidence.

Now these sovereigns who thus inflicted the most fearful evils on Christianity, without doubt considered themselves perfectly authorized in the use they made of their powers over the Church. They held themselves responsible to no human power for the right discharge of their duties. They looked on the Church just as statesmen now do,—as an engine of State policy. The bishoprics and abbacies were spiritual lordships, which they dispensed on the same principles as they granted investiture of temporal lordships. They set aside altogether the question of spiritual qualifications: the only qualification they recognized was interest or money. Simony, in the gross form of giving and receiving money for the sale of spiritual offices, was a vice adapted to a coarse age; and open profligacy, and military enterprises, were the shapes which worldliness assumed in those days. In a more refined age, the worldly spirit would have manifested itself in a different way. A baron in the nineteenth century is a very different person from a baron of the tenth century, though he may be under the influence of exactly the same passions. The spirit of the world is now a polite and civilized spirit.

We look back now with disgust on the descriptions we have of the episcopate in the tenth and eleventh centuries, but we forget that their vices were only those of the age. They merely followed the world in their days. They were "men of the world." The world was on very good terms with them. We do not hear that the sovereigns and barons thought the worse of the bishops for their simony and their concubinage. There seems to have been a cordial alliance between the Church and the State, between the Church and the world. The world had no troublesome monitor, no preacher of soberness, and righteousness, and judgment to come. The Church's witness was at an end: it was joined with the world in the service of the god of this world.

No doctrine, it is true, was touched: the Church remained in possession of its traditionary religion; but it was a cold and lifeless system, borne down beneath the weight of moral corruption and practical infidelity. The world had for ages been in possession of all the strong places of the Church, and, there seated, held in subjugation the greater part of its members.

The condition of the Church under the royal supremacy of the successors of Charlemagne and their contemporary sovereigns, will have reminded the reader in many ways of the state of the English Church for the last century and a half. We live, of course, under a different social system, and therefore our evils have been all connected with refinement, civilization, and policy. But nevertheless there are the same great features and principles in both cases: a State possessing itself of authority over the Church; exercising that authority wisely and well in the first instance, then treating the Church as a mere State engine; ignoring its spiritual character and objects; subjecting it to the legislation of worldly men; placing worldly men in its most important positions and offices; suppressing, as far as possible, all reformation emanating from purely Church sources; and, in fine, succeeding in imposing, to a great degree, its own character of worldliness on the Church. Hence, in both cases, the discipline of the Church became relaxed, theological studies were neglected, the prelates of the Church became courtiers and politicians, servants of sovereigns and ministers; and forgot their peculiar and first duty,—the ministry of the Sacraments and of God's Word, and the guardianship of the Faith; a general secularity invaded all classes, and the world and the Church were joined together in firm alliance. The Church learned to depend wholly on the protection and guidance of a State which showed, by all its acts, that it had no religious principle.—Such was the fallen condition of the Church in the tenth and eleventh centuries; nevertheless there were not wanting witnesses against this prevalent corruption, and they discerned at length the real cause of the evil, and set themselves to remedy it.

“The entire secularization of the Church,” says Hasse, “stood at an alarming height, and the necessity for a combination of power was the more stringent, in order to extricate herself from this disgraceful dependence on feudal dominion. Since the time of her sinking into this state of subserviency, voices had not been wanting, which loudly complained and zealously resisted these abuses. But they were not listened to, because the whole system must acquire a certain influence before it could be felt in its crying opposition to the true notion of a Church. This period occurred in the middle of the eleventh century, when these commotions originated, which aimed at the release of the Church from her bondage, and finally led to the ‘Investiture war’ with



which the great struggle between Church and State more especially began, and which continued during the whole of the middle ages.”—*Anselm*, pp. 54, 55.

When the power of the State over the Church has been for a long series of years established by law and with the original consent of the Church itself, it possesses a hold over men's minds which cannot be shaken by almost any amount of abuse. Without doubt there were many men in those ages who secretly lamented the fallen condition of the Church, and who, on fitting occasions, expressed their disapprobation of the principles on which ecclesiastical preferments were disposed of by the State; but they submitted to the abuses of the system, consoling themselves, without doubt, with the hope that God would dispose the hearts of rulers to act more justly towards the Church, and that it was their duty to remain in quietness and obedience to those laws, and that constitution in Church and State under which they had been placed by Divine Providence. They felt, we may suppose, that the removal of the corruptions and abuses of the Church was the duty of their bishops; and that to the hierarchy and to the rulers of the State all such high questions should be left. They, probably, persuaded themselves that their duty lay in the care of their own parishes, and the souls immediately entrusted to them; and that they had no call or claim to enter on the reformation of the Church. They may have mistrusted their own judgments perhaps, and may have supposed that they might have been misinformed as to the amount of the evils of their times, when they saw that the hierarchy were perfectly silent and acquiescent, and that no steps were taken to protect the episcopal office from the abuses of patronage which had occurred. It did not seem to them that there was any remedy, except in an improved moral and religious tone amongst rulers. Very probably they may have never imagined it possible that the Church could recover the power of electing her own bishops; they may not have been able to conceive the notion of a bishop appointed by the Church instead of the State, or, if they did, they probably shrank with affright from the notion, as involving the separation of Church and State, the confiscation of Church property, and renewed persecution. And there would not be wanting arguments gathered from Scripture, and from ecclesiastical history, to show how lawful and right the supremacy of Christian kings is. The fathers, the councils, and the popes of former ages, could be quoted in abundance in proof of the lawfulness of the power exercised by the emperors and kings over the Church. Then, there was the old established law of the land; the practice of past ages; the respect and obedience due to the sovereign; the fear of his displeasure; the consent of the barons,

and nobles, and spiritual peers to the existing system. Any one who was dissatisfied with that system, and expressed his dissatisfaction, was, without doubt, regarded as a dangerous man; and must make up his mind to be frowned upon by the great, and excluded from promotion, as an enthusiast, or as a factious, seditious, and designing person.

It is such arguments as these which generally weigh with the mass of well-disposed and conscientious persons. They are averse from agitation of any kind, and they look to their superiors for guidance; they are disposed to trust in those superiors, and to believe that God's blessing will attend on this trusting submission to the powers that be. It was this view and feeling which probably protracted for centuries the evils of the Western Church; for neither princes nor prelates attempted any reformation. Princes were but temporal rulers, and judged every thing by the rules and principles of temporal policy; and the prelates were all *thoroughly mixed up with the transactions of the State*. They had purchased their bishoprics, they sold their parochial benefices, or they had been advanced without the slightest regard to qualifications or to the Church's spiritual good, possessing no claims except nobility of birth, or high interest, or services to sovereigns, or nobles, or ministers. They were in habits of intercourse with archbishops and bishops who had been appointed in the same way. They took part in ordaining such bishops. They sat with them in Diet or Parliament, which had superseded the synod of the Church. They were always about the court, high in favour with princes and ministers, invested with lofty titles, and extensive political power and jurisdiction; and they thought that this was indeed a "good" system, which thus placed the heads of the Church high in the courts of princes. They loved that system, and they wished for no alteration in it. They were very lenient to its abuses; and, without doubt, their advice to the clergy who complained of those abuses was always, "Be quiet." They, probably, charged their clergy on all occasions to attend to their parochial duties, and to let the Church remain *at peace*. "Peace," peace with this world, with the powers of this world, with the system of this world's rulers, was, without doubt, their perpetual admonition.—And it was to such spiritual rulers, to men who were completely identified with the system of Church and State union then existing, that the Church looked up for aid!

Certainly nothing seemed more hopeless, humanly speaking. The episcopate, as a body, was in favour of a system which had nearly eaten out the life of the Church; and what could be done without the episcopate?

The evil was apparently irremediable, and yet, the Church found

a way to shake off the incubus that pressed upon her, though the struggle was a desperate one.

The first indication of what was coming was seen in the revival of learning. Any great movement in the Church is generally preceded by this sign. It was remarkably instanced at the Reformation, in the sixteenth century. From A. D. 1000 there was a general movement of intellect in the Church; theological studies revived, and schools were established. The time for change was come.

A party or school in the Church now began to grow up, which was at first very weak, but which gradually gained influence. This was the reforming party, which sought an alteration in the relations of Church and State, and which ultimately carried its point.

The see of Rome itself had fallen into deeper degradation than almost any other see in the West, and it was here that the struggle commenced. We must briefly touch on the antecedent circumstances.

It has been already observed, that the appointment of the pope was in the hands of Charlemagne and his successors. In course of time, in consequence of the temporary dissolution of the empire, the Roman States became independent for some years, and the appointment of the popes was usurped by the lawless and licentious nobles around Rome. After several most disgraceful appointments, usurpations, and schisms, pope John XII., one of the most licentious and reprobate of the series, was obliged to seek the protection of Otho, king of Germany, against the tyrants of Italy, and, in acknowledgment of the services rendered by that monarch, crowned him, in A. D. 962, as the successor of Charlemagne.

Invested with the empire, Otho became possessed of the ecclesiastical authority attached to it by law and ancient custom, and he put it in exercise by summoning a council at Rome for the trial of pope John, who was deposed for immorality; and another was elected in his stead under the virtual nomination of the emperor. An attempt was made by a party to maintain pope John's cause, and on his death a successor was elected; but the imperial authority prevailed by force of arms.

From this time, except for a short period, during which, on account of political disturbances, the papacy fell again under the power of the petty princes of the vicinity, the emperors exercised the power of appointing the bishops of Rome. One of these, Benedict IX., being desirous of contracting marriage, which involved his resignation of the papal see, entered into communication with the archpriest of Rome, named John Gratianus, and, on receiving from the latter a sum of money, resigned in his favour,



and, on his election by the clergy and people of Rome, consecrated him with his own hands as his successor, by the name of Gregory VI., A. D. 1044.

The object of Gregory VI., in this very irregular proceeding, was to assert, in opposition to the aristocracy, the long-dormant right of the Roman clergy and people to the free election of their spiritual pastor. He was amongst the most religious of the Roman clergy; and on this occasion we first discern the existence of a reforming party in the Church.

“Unlettered as he was,” says Mr. Bowden, “and unworthy as had been the mode of his exaltation, Gregory VI. seems to have been supported against his rivals by whatever of high feeling or Catholic principles yet existed in the papal city. A school was now growing up, at Rome and elsewhere, of men, who, disgusted with the outrageous corruptions of the Church, pined for her reformation; and who at the same time felt, that such reformation, to be essential and permanent, must be connected with her liberation from the thralldom in which she had long been held, to secular aristocratical power. The supreme functions of her internal government having become—as though by the general consent of the collective episcopacy of the West—entrusted to the pope, they saw that the vigour of her administration must be crippled throughout, if the pontiff continued either the dependent nominee of a German monarch, or the creature of a Tusculan court. They beheld the spirit of feudalism gradually drawing the hierarchies of the different nations of Europe more and more into its system, and confounding the spiritual character with the secularities around them.”—*Bowden*, i. 113.

This first attempt of the anti-secular party at Rome proved a failure: for the emperor Henry had his own notions of ecclesiastical reform; he was a reformer in his own way; and his remedy for the evils of the Roman Church was to convene a synod of his bishops, and by their aid to cause the various claimants of the papal throne to resign or be deposed, and then to nominate a new pope himself.

Amongst those who resigned was Gregory, the pope of the anti-secular, or Church party of that day. His resignation, which they considered with some reason to be a forced one, caused a strong feeling of discontent in their minds. They had established in his case, as they had hoped, the principle of free election by the Church, and they saw in that principle the only instrument which might avail to save the Church from the impending danger of an increased thralldom to the temporal power, which had so grossly and so long abused its privileges.

“Those, however, to whom thoughts like these suggested themselves, were but few; and the cause with which they connected themselves was disgraced by too many foul stains, to permit them to hope for any

general sympathy. Nor, however universal their feelings might have been, did there exist, in their long corrupted and degraded city, sufficient strength for any demonstration in opposition to the German sovereign's power."—*Bowden*, i. 120.

The result of the movement, then, was in the first instance very unfortunate. Like the opposition in the Hampden case, it placed the Church in a worse position than before, and consolidated the power of the sovereign. The pope was directly nominated by the emperor; and he left in triumph, carrying along with him into banishment the deprived pope of the Church party, and some of his more active supporters.

"This party, if we may so style them who were yet scarcely beginning to feel their union in the maintenance of the same great principles, seems now to have had its representatives spread over Western Europe; embracing in its fellowship several of the most learned, the most devoted, the most pure, among the Churchmen of the day. But its apparent force, as a party, even in its centre, the papal city, was as yet but small. The great majority of well-disposed men, naturally delighted at their liberation from such scenes as those which they had recently witnessed, and from the tyranny of such factions as those of Benedict and Sylvester, were disposed to hail with acclamations every step of the reforming monarch's career; he saw in that career the assertion of every principle fraught with danger to the future welfare of either Church or State. And Henry himself, it is probable, did no more than concur in opinion with these, in regarding the men whom he might perceive to be thus discontented, as theoretic speculators, better acquainted with books than with men, and vainly aiming, in human things, at a state of ideal perfection. The monarch could not understand the ties of sympathy which united those learned, pure, and thoughtful men, with those whom similar studies, similar contemplations, and similar purity of life, were leading in other countries to the adoption of similar sentiments. And still less could he appreciate the power which those principles, when appealed to in hours of trial, might excite over the hearts and affections of mankind."—*Bowden*, i. 124.

Amongst the members of this "Church" party was Hildebrand, a young monk, a native of Tuscany, who had passed his earlier years at Rome, and, being disgusted with the degeneracy of the Church there, had sought for a more fervent religion in the monastery of Cluni, in Burgundy. On his return to Rome, the zeal and strictness of principles which distinguished him, rendered him unpopular among the lax and worldly Churchmen of that day: but he took part with the unfortunate Gregory VI. in the struggle for the liberty of elections; and, on the failure of that enterprise, was obliged to leave Rome, and return again to

the monastery of Cluni, where his eminent qualifications raised him speedily to the office of prior.

The "Church" party of that day was now apparently defeated. The emperor had nominated his pope, and appeared as a sturdy reformer of abuses, thus enlisting the public sympathies on behalf of the royal supremacy. The pope died in a year or two, and the emperor *again* nominated a pope. Scarcely had the latter ascended the pontifical throne when he died, and Henry had to nominate a third pope within the space of three years.

On this occasion, Bruno, bishop of Toul, was nominated by the emperor. Bruno was a pious, zealous, and unambitious man, and this was just the most dangerous person who could have been chosen under the circumstances. He had a high opinion of Hildebrand, and invited him to accompany him to Rome, where, on his arrival, his first step was to seek for the election of the Clergy and people of Rome, thus acknowledging that the emperor's appointment was *insufficient*.

This was a step, the importance of which was not seen at the time, but it involved principles which were carried out steadily from this time. The Church had now at its head a bishop who had the power and the will to reform abuses; and the emperor, who was equally zealous in the cause of reform, was delighted to see the zeal with which pope Leo held synods throughout Italy, Germany, and France, and deposed bishops and archbishops who had obtained their sees by simony, and condemned those who were guilty of immorality. From this moment the Church party began to gain the ascendancy: the popes were elected regularly by the Clergy and the people of Rome, and ere long the celebrated decree made by ecclesiastical authority investing the cardinals with the power of electing the pope, laid the foundation of a system which has endured for ages. The emperors attempted to maintain their right of nomination, and they were deprived of it only because the empire was so divided that they were unable to give their whole attention to the Church of Rome. It was soon seen that there were incurable vices in the system of royal nomination, and public opinion throughout Europe supported the Church in its struggle. On the accession of Hildebrand, the leader of the Church party, to the papal throne, the struggle came to an issue; and we shall here use the language of Professor Hasse which briefly states its issue.

"The great Reformation advanced, and when Hildebrand himself mounted the papal throne in 1073, he carried the contest to a most decisive pitch; whilst at a Roman Council, 1075, he prohibited 'Lay investiture,' and threatened with excommunication, not only the Clergy who received investiture from a temporal hand, but the princes and



nobles who claimed for themselves the right. . . . To force the emperor to an acknowledgment of the prohibition, and the surrender of his right of investiture, was the main point at issue; and it is well known what gigantic efforts were required to reach this aim. Gregory himself and Henry IV. died in the struggle; the one in exile, the other under excommunication. Anti-popes and anti-kings entered the field: Italy and Germany blazed with the fiercest wars. Almost half a century passed before the settlement of the protracted struggle. By the concordat of Worms (1122) the emperor gave back to God, the Apostles Peter and Paul, and the Holy Catholic Church, all investiture with ring and crosier, and conceded that *in all Churches, the election and consecration should take place free, according to ecclesiastical laws, without restraint and simony*: on the other hand, the pope approved that the elected should receive from the emperor through the sceptre the regalia, and thereupon rendered to 'Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's.' Although the investiture struggle in the last instance only could be decided in Germany, yet it was fought out in all other countries."—*Anselm*, pp. 58, 59.

Thus the issue of the whole was, that the State, in consequence of its gross and long continued abuse of the right of ecclesiastical patronage, lost its ancient rights, and had the discomfort of seeing the papacy possess itself of all the powers, patronage, and influence over the Church which had once been its own.

Scandalous abuses persisted in with obstinacy work their own cure. The most powerful sovereigns have experienced the truth of this: injustice and corruption are sure to be punished in the long run. It was so in the twelfth century, and it will be so in the nineteenth.

The sovereigns of England, in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, were amongst the most powerful princes of the West. William the Conqueror inherited from preceding kings of England great powers in ecclesiastical matters, and he exercised them vigorously. Lanfranc was appointed archbishop of Canterbury, royal chaplains were appointed to other sees, and every opportunity was taken to appoint Normans to the government of the Church and monasteries.

"All these nominations proceeded immediately from the king, in which he rather followed the counsel of his barons than that of his Clergy, and so zealously insisted on his right of investiture, that when Lanfranc once asked him for the appointment to an abbey which for ages had belonged to the see of Canterbury, he replied that 'he would not suffer a single crozier in England to be out of his hands.' He abstained, indeed, from enriching his treasury on the appointment of bishops (although he not unfrequently sold abbeys), so that only a single case of simony occurred. But according to Eadmer he only

chose for prelates 'people in whom it would have been accounted dishonourable not to have been subservient to the king's will in every respect ; and every one knew under what circumstances and for what purpose they were appointed.' For 'all things, divine and human, must be directed according to his will ;' even the primate of his kingdom, at the assembly of a General Council, could adopt no measure without his approval and previous consultation. And in like manner, no bishop dared to summon before him any of his barons and friends, although guilty of the most open incest or adultery, without his permission ; or to pass sentence of excommunication, or impose any other ecclesiastical penalty. Yet, under William I. things always went on tolerably well, for the king had the highest opinion of Lanfranc, who made use of his interest as far as he could for the good of the Church, although we frequently hear him bitterly complaining how little he was able to effect."—*Anselm*, pp. 64, 65.

The Church remained satisfied under the administration of William the Conqueror, even at the time when the Church and State in other parts of Europe were in violent collision ; for there was no such gross and palpable abuse of royal power as could have afforded any pretext for disturbing the alliance of Church and State. But on the accession of William Rufus, the inherent vices of the system of royal supremacy became manifest. Rufus had inherited from his predecessors the right of enjoying the revenues of vacant sees, "*jus spolii et regaliæ*." This power had been conceded to the Crown together with investiture, on the assumption that it would be justly used ; but in the hands of Rufus it became a dreadful evil, for he permitted the bishoprics to remain vacant, as their incumbents died, in order that he might possess their revenues, and when in possession, he injured in all ways the property of the Church.

The archbishopric of Canterbury was thus kept vacant for several years, and it was the expressed intention of the king to appoint no archbishop during his lifetime ; at length, however, it was filled up under the following circumstances.

When the see of Canterbury had been vacant for nearly four years, the most respectable amongst the nobles of England, assembled at court at Christmas, 1092, agreed to address a petition to the king, "that they might at least be permitted to call upon God for the restoration of the archbishopric ;" that the king would permit that prayers should be offered up in all the churches for this end. The king was embarrassed by this request, but he felt that he was not strong enough to refuse it, and accordingly Anselm, abbot of Bec, who was then in England, and was highly esteemed by every one, was directed to prepare a "form of prayer," which was used in the churches ; the Crown

exercising, apparently, the power of directing the composition of special forms, at that time as it does now.

This was the first step, and it did not seem what was next to be done, or whether any thing more could be done. However, the next step *was* taken, and it proved a *failure*. One of the nobles ventured to mention the name of Anselm in the course of confidential conversation with the king, observing that "in truth he lived only for God, his desires rested on nothing else." "Indeed!" said the king, "not even on the archbishopric of Canterbury?" The king took occasion to express his resolution that "no one should be archbishop but himself!"

It is a curious fact, that the *bishops* of England appear to have kept in the back-ground: they were apparently afraid to move lest they should incur the king's displeasure. They were generally men who had been appointed by William the Conqueror with the express object of maintaining the royal power. They were, in fact, more under the influence of the Crown than of the Church. The sequel will show this more plainly.

Apparently matters would have rested here, had not the king been seized with illness which threatened his life. In the immediate prospect of death, barons and prelates took courage to tell him the truth, and exhort him to think of his soul.

"Anselm by chance was in the neighbourhood of Gloucester when this occurrence took place. He was at once sent for, and requested to administer consolation to the king in his last moments. The first thing, he declared, must be a sincere confession, and the king must acknowledge his sins, and promise reformation. If there was yet time, he might then do what his nobles had advised him. In the agony of death the king consented to all. He confessed to Anselm, and called the bishops present as witnesses, that he at the same time vowed in future to exercise righteousness and mercy. On the high altar at Gloucester, they must lay their vows in his stead; and an edict, furnished with the king's seal, was thereupon published, which ordered the liberation of all prisoners; released debtors from outstanding sums, and offered pardon to all offences against his person. Good, holy laws, as in the time of king Edward, were to be re-established, justice impartially administered, and every violation of it strictly punished. The people received with joy this royal declaration, and flocked to the churches, in order to thank God, and pray for the king's recovery. The nobles now more urgently renewed their request for the nomination of an archbishop of Canterbury. The king was ready to comply, and, under the most excited expectation of those around him, *none of whom ventured to recommend any one*, nominated the abbot Anselm as the most worthy to fill that honourable station. An universal cry of exultation followed, whilst Anselm turned pale; and when the bishops wished to introduce him to the king, in order to receive the crozier from his



hand, he offered the most violent resistance. The astonished bishops took him aside, and with the most urgent entreaties, besought him to take charge of the oppressed Church."—*Anselm*, pp. 74, 75.

It is needless to occupy space by going further into details. Suffice it to say, that Anselm was at length compelled by force to receive investiture, and to assume the archiepiscopal office.

Here was the grand step gained which opened the way to the reform of the Church, and the restoration of its liberties. The Church party at once gained a *leader* who was in the highest position in the Church. Anselm went to work steadily, to remove the plague of simony, and to obtain the restoration of the synods which had been suspended by royal authority; he also insisted on the recognition of one of the contending popes, in order to place the Church of England under his protection, and thereby to counterbalance the royal supremacy. Rufus, offended with the archbishop for declining to pay him a large sum on his appointment to the see, recognized the pope in the hope of obtaining his aid in the attempt to expel Anselm; but in this design he failed, and Anselm had the support of the papacy in the struggle which ensued.

We must here introduce some sketches of the episcopate at that period.

William was bishop of Durham at this time:—a note, in the "Life of Anselm," gives us this information about him.

"William, as friend of Odo, bishop of Bayeux, the brother of the Conqueror, obtained the bishopric of Durham; 'a man who attained his ecclesiastical dignity, not for his spiritual endowments, but, like the other Norman ecclesiastics, on account of his abilities as a courtier, man of business, and warrior.' He conspired with bishop Odo for the sake of establishing Robert on the English throne, and must leave England. He was restored to his see after the peace of Caen, 1091. He was, consequently, a firm adherent of the king's."—p. 82.

Ralph Flambard, a royal chaplain, was the king's justiciary, and appearing at Canterbury on the archbishop's enthronement, summoned the archbishop before his court, and commenced a legal process against the Church of Canterbury. Of him we read as follows:—

"He was surnamed 'Flambard,' or 'passe Flambard,' on account of his ability in discovering hidden treasures, according to William of Malmesbury. According to Anselm, 'propter crudelitatem similem flammæ comburenti.' Under William the Conqueror he had been made royal chaplain, and continued so under his successor, until his appointment to the see of Durham, in 1099. He also served the king

as 'summus regiarum opum procurator et justiciarius,' and was his 'exactor crudelissimus et consiliarius præcipuus,' *his chief instrument in enriching the royal treasury with the possessions of the Church.*"

It is a curious illustration of the relations of Church and State at that time, that this person, who was the chief agent of the crown in plundering the Church, was rewarded for his unscrupulous conduct with the bishopric of Durham! The dignities of the Church actually became the incentives to disloyalty towards the Church, whenever the State was hostile to the Church. It is consolatory to find that the nineteenth and eighteenth centuries are not without parallel in former ages, in exhibiting instances of Clergy who have taken part with the State against the Church, and gained their reward.

The bishops of England had been most vehement in pressing Anselm to accept the archbishopric, as soon as they learnt that it was the will of the king to offer it to him; their subsequent conduct exhibits them in the character of consistent courtiers. A council was called at Rockingham, at Anselm's request, to consider the lawfulness of recognizing the pope, which Anselm pressed, and the king objected to. Anselm explained the points in dispute before the council, and then directing his words to the bishops, said to them, that the time had now arrived for them to fulfil the promise they had made on his elevation to the see of Canterbury, to support him with counsel and aid when his office might oppress him. We must continue the narrative in Hasse's words, which are really curious as illustrating a tone of mind in the bishops of those days, of which we have had many instances in our own times.

"The bishops answered, that they *were unable to suggest counsel* in such a difficult emergency, and must leave the decision to his own judgment. What they most desired *was his unconditional* (sine omni aliâ conditione) *submission to the king*, and then they would be able to restore things into their proper channel. . . . When the bishops and the barons had again assembled in the church, Anselm repeated his request that they would assist him with their advice. They replied, 'that they knew of no other means of issue than that he would simply submit himself to the king; but if he relied on spiritual counsel (secundum Deum), then they must be silent.'

How perfectly this was the language of courtiers and politicians, unwilling to enter on the discussion of the question of religious principle and duty, and resolved to look at the case and decide it only on grounds of worldly policy; and that policy involving implicit and absolute submission to the will of the temporal ruler!

Without doubt these servile prelates were of the opinion of Robert Count of Meulant, one of the king's counsellors, who said, "that the true majesty is only of God, and the *crimen læsæ majestatis* was therefore so called, because the king was the image of God upon earth."—p. 82.

In short, Anselm was left completely alone by the prelacy of England in his contest with the king, and he even found amongst them his chief opponents. The spokesman of the king's party, the bishop of Durham, pledged himself to compel Anselm either to renounce the pope or to resign his see, and, having collected a great number of bishops and barons, went to Anselm, and declared that the king would proceed against him for high treason, if he did not at once renounce the pope. After further discussion, the result was, that *all the bishops* (except one or two) *and abbots withdrew their obedience from Anselm*, and refused to acknowledge him as archbishop any longer, *in obedience to the king's command*.

A temporary reconciliation having taken place between Anselm and the king, the bishops hastened to apologize to the archbishop, and to renew their promise of canonical obedience; but the moment the contest began again, on occasion of Anselm's wish to visit the pope, the prelates, true to their principles, were again on the king's side; and, on this occasion, their principles were expressed in the most undisguised manner. When Anselm had explained to a deputation of barons and bishops who came to him from the king, that he considered himself bound, for the sake of his own salvation, and that of the flock entrusted to him, to persist in his request to visit the pope, their reply was, "Abstain, for the king will never concede it."

"He then proceeded to explain to the bishops the reasons for his journey, and asked their opinion as to the validity of them. They replied, 'that they all really acknowledged the piety of Anselm; but that as to themselves, they had too many earthly regards, too many relatives to provide for, &c., and were unable so entirely to turn their backs upon the world.' Anselm's aims were too exalted for them. If he would lower himself to their standard, they professed their readiness to support him; but if he relied upon God alone, then they must leave him to himself, for on no account could they detach themselves from the king."—*Anselm*, pp. 108, 109.

Such illustrations of the spirit of the episcopate at that time show, that the tendency of the royal supremacy, as exercised in the nomination of bishops, is much the same in all ages,—that in the twelfth, just as much as in the eighteenth century, it created a worldly episcopate. If we see any thing of this spirit in our own times, it is evident, at least, that the reformation of the Church has not caused it, but the influence of the temporal power.



The controversy was at length terminated, after a long struggle, by king Henry's being obliged to relinquish the right of investiture, and the possession of episcopal revenues, during the vacancy of sees.

In the reign of Henry II. the Crown endeavoured to restore the great powers in ecclesiastical matters which it had formerly possessed, and especially to make the Church tribunals wholly subordinate to the State. In the contest which ensued between Becket and the king, we find again the episcopate of England, for the most part, adherents of the Crown.

But in these contests, and in that which ensued under king John, in which the Crown of England was obliged at length to relinquish all interference with elections of bishops and deans, and to restore the liberties of the Church in the amplest manner, there were two great advantages on the side of the Church,—the advantage of a leader in the person of the archbishop of Canterbury, and the advantage of a connexion with, and dependence on, a spiritual power abroad, which was independent of the Crown of England. This latter power balanced the power of the Crown, and protected the Church in its contest for liberty; though we know that it took advantage of these circumstances to extend its own dominion, and, in fact, to enslave the Church, just as much as the Crown had done.

And this leads us to compare the position now occupied by the Church of England with that which she occupied in the twelfth century, and to consider what prospects there may be of deliverance.

In the first place, the temporal power is now possessed of ecclesiastical prerogatives and powers quite as great as those of the kings in the twelfth century. It has also the advantage of having wholly got rid of the papacy as an opponent; the Church cannot derive any aid from that quarter; on the contrary, the Romish party would be the first to make the State power over the Church more absolute than it is, in the hope of degrading the Church and destroying it. Besides this, the State acts on a most jealous and cautious policy in its appointments to the archiepiscopal office. There is not the slightest chance of a second Becket, or Anselm, or Laud; it makes sure of its man. It holds by law the absolute power of appointing bishops and deans, and of compelling their election and consecration. It holds the power of preventing our synods from meeting, either by law, or by its influence over the archbishops. It has acquired the power of legislating for the Church. It is supported by a great body of adherents—by all the sectarians, by the evangelical party in the Church, by the rationalistic party, by statesmen of all parties in general, by radicals and

liberals for the most part, and by a great many Churchmen who apply the principles of the sixteenth century to the nineteenth, without considering the change of circumstances.

But, on the other hand, the State now is a very different thing from what it was in the eleventh century. It is no longer a monarchy, the head of which concentrates the power of the State in his own hands, and whose will is for the most part paramount to all other considerations; a sovereign personally jealous of his own power and prerogative, and able to enforce it by stringent and arbitrary measures. The State is not this any longer; it is a democracy, retaining only the ceremonial of monarchy. The sovereign is powerless. All power has passed ultimately to the heterogeneous assembly in the House of Commons, and to the people. The government is consequently weak, vacillating, liable to be influenced by agitation, and unable to repress movements for liberty. It dare not take the course which a Rufus or a Henry would have taken to suppress agitation. All agitation which has the slightest appearance of reason on its side prevails over the government in spite of its resistance, sooner or later. The divisions of political parties may, in almost any important question, paralyze the movements of a government. In the present day, the tendency of every thing is, to remove restrictions on liberty generally; and if a case of grievance and oppression can be established, and if arbitrary and absolute power can be proved to have been abused, there is nothing that may not be accomplished, provided there be a sufficient amount of perseverance in bringing grievances before the public. The sovereignty has *in fact* devolved on *the people*, and if any large portion of the people are resolved on carrying any point, it is certain to be carried. Let any measure become a measure of *reform*, and it is at once put in the way of being carried. We live in an age of reform, and it will be impossible to resist the reform of abuses, if the public mind can be to any extent roused.

And now to come to the condition of the Church.

The Church, then, no longer includes the whole population of the country, but is opposed by many sects, and she is also weakened by parties within her own communion. She is no longer supported by the papacy, which in former ages was her great helper in her struggles with the State. She is in communion with churches beyond the limits of England, and with churches which are independent of the English State; but there is practically little intercourse with them; nor are they looked to, as yet, for support. Our archbishops are always certain to be partisans of the State, and our bishops are generally so to a considerable extent, though we are thankful, in comparing the

conduct of our episcopate at present with that of their predecessors in the twelfth century, to see so much more of Christian courage and faith in the present day.

Nevertheless, though the Church has been much weakened by these various causes, we believe that the State has been still more weakened in proportion; and this debility of the State will, we think, make up for all the advantages and powers which the Church has been deprived of, so that she will be able, we trust, without any actual resistance to the law, to obtain the gradual removal of the grievances which oppress her, and a modification of that arbitrary legislation of the sixteenth century which represses her energies, and places her at a disadvantage as compared with all other communions of professing Christians within the British dominions.

It is true that the Church is *divided*. Of her bishops some are evangelical, some are rationalistic, several are partisans of the State, and care perhaps for little but the temporal advantages of the Church. Considerable parties are adherents of the State, and are able to throw various imputations on the motives of those who seek the reform of our laws on Church matters. Nevertheless, we do not think that any of these difficulties are insurmountable. These parties are all on the defensive, and if they get on the offensive, they will only weaken themselves, and strengthen the cause they dread. The country is not prepared for evangelical or rationalistic reforms in the Prayer Book, any more than for reforms in the opposite direction; nor will it enable the government to turn out of the Church all who seek for its liberty. If the State party get up counter addresses, petitions, &c., they will produce no effect ultimately in resisting the demands of those who have right on their side. They will only add to the agitation, protract the contest, and create additional embarrassment to government and to those bishops who wish the law to remain exactly as it is, and no disturbance to be made. Their *best* course is that which they have been pursuing hitherto,—silence and quiet; but that course is evidently a losing one in the long-run. The movement for Church rights arises from no transient or evanescent feeling; it is not the result of excitement, though circumstances have greatly added to its power. It arises from evils which all the world perceives, and which are continually thrown in our teeth by all the enemies of the Church. If we seek to know the abuses of the State supremacy over the Church, we can be at no loss; they are the grand popular arguments against the Church of England, which sectarians of all kinds are continually plying. We feel a state of the law which leaves us open to such attacks to be a grievance. It comes home to the Clergy and laity



in many other ways, that the interests of religion are compromised by the operation of existing laws. And when all this is so, it is not to be expected that men will remain quiet, and abstain from seeking what they deem requisite for the welfare of their Church and the security of their religion.

There are men in the Church to whom such considerations are of *primary* importance, and who disregard all other considerations in comparison with them; and to such men it is perfectly vain to talk of "Peace, peace," and to urge them to abstain from agitating their claims. Those who do so mistake the views of the persons they address. They do not understand that it is nothing but a principle of "duty to God and to His Church," which has induced others to undertake responsibility and labour; and such men cannot, therefore, attend to exhortations to be at "peace," and to abstain from "agitation," since they would be, in their own opinion, relinquishing their duty to God by attending to that advice. Without doubt such recommendations come very well from those who think their duty consists in sitting still; but they can have no weight with those who think it their duty to press forward. More than one of the bishops has felt it his duty to advise their Clergy against taking any share in Church unions, or other organization for Church purposes. If these prelates feel that the interests of the Church are likely to be compromised by any such system of combination, they are quite right to express their opinion; but, at the same time, we must add, that it appears to us that any bishop would be going beyond the limits of his duty and of his authority in condemning such combinations, and requiring their dissolution; because there is nothing, that we are aware of, either in the canons of the Church, or in the law of the land, to prevent the establishment of Church unions, or any other organization, having for its object the restoration of the Church's rights.

Under the English constitution, it is the recognized right of any class in the community who think themselves aggrieved, to combine for the purpose of seeking legislative relief from laws which they consider oppressive, or for any other object consistent with obedience to the laws. This is distinctly a legal and constitutional right, which all Englishmen, whether Clergy or laity, are possessed of; and which they can be deprived of only by the law itself. With the highest deference and respect for the episcopal office, (especially when it is legally and canonically exercised,) we conceive that its powers do not necessarily extend to the suppression of the civil rights enjoyed by the Clergy and laity. The same may be said with regard to the canons. If the canons do not forbid Churchmen to adopt measures, in combina-

tion, for the restoration of the Church's rights, and for the enforcement of the canons themselves, no bishop is authorized to use his authority for the suppression of such efforts. He may express his opinion, and discourage them; but, to go further than this, would seem to be an infringement on the Christian liberties of Churchmen. If their conduct is violent, if their language is unchristian, they may indeed be deserving of censure in these respects.

When, therefore, bishops are heard expressing their fears or dissatisfaction at Church movements, directed either to the protection of the faith against State liberalism, or to the restoration of Church rights, or the removal of grievances caused by the present operation of the laws, it must be remembered that those prelates are merely giving expression to their own individual opinions, and are not authorized, either by the Church or the State, to enforce those opinions on others. It must also be remembered, that bishops who are nominated by the State, and who owe to it, and *not to the Church*, the possession of their emoluments and dignities, are not necessarily the best and most impartial judges in questions between the Church and the State; and that they will be regarded as inclining so much towards the interests of the State, that their *opinions* on any such question will have less weight than they could themselves wish. If, indeed, any prelate should have proved by his personal conduct, that he is able to act independently, and that he is prepared to make the cause of religious truth, and of the Church's well-being, his first object, and to regard the interests of ministers and political parties as of inferior moment, his opinion on any question must have great weight, and will of course receive all the deference due to it, while, in a matter of opinion, men must act in the mode they deliberately believe to be necessary for the security of the Church.

It is evident, however, that there are prelates who are wholly devoted to the temporal power, as might indeed be expected under the present system of appointment to bishoprics; and their sentiments will of course have little weight with those who are on the other side of the question. It is impossible to conceal from ourselves that on the episcopal bench are Evangelicals and Rationalists who are unsound in the faith, and Erastians who would sacrifice the Church's most cherished rights at the bidding of the temporal power. And, on the other hand, we are thankful to see many orthodox and religious prelates; and although we have to lament the presence of evil in some of the high places in the Church, we may comfort ourselves by the assurance that our case is not worse than that of our forefathers in the twelfth century.

ART. IV.—1. *In Memoriam.* London: Moxon. 1850.

2. *Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day. A Poem.* By ROBERT BROWNING. London: Chapman and Hall. 1850.

3. *The Virgin Widow. A Play.* By HENRY TAYLOR, *Author of "Philip von Artevelde."* Longmans. 1850.

AMIDST the existing trials and troubles of Christ's Church, the progress of poetry, however important in itself to the welfare of a people, may appear at least of minor consequence; among the stirring war-notes of the trump of controversy, the voice of the nightingale may well-nigh be hushed. However, two of the works before us, at least, possess such eminent merit in their respective spheres, that they have won our attention, even at this present crisis. Indeed, we cannot allow such passing troubles, however grievous, to engross our critical attention, or our individual minds: we are convinced that our Anglican branch of the Church Catholic is firmly built upon the One Rock, and that no tempest can uprear her from her strong foundations; and this conviction we are anxious to show forth, by devoting at least our usual amount of space to the literary and other questions of the day. We are not only convinced that "all things work together for good to God's elect," but also, that our English Church, despite her sins and short-comings, is in possession of the especial presence of her God, and is destined to be the great champion of Christianity in the approaching warfare with the spirit of Antichrist throughout the civilized world: and, in this persuasion, whatever foes assail or friends desert us, we may grieve indeed for the perversity of man, but our cheeks shall not blanch, neither shall our hearts be troubled. We mourn over existing divisions, but are intimately convinced that they subserve some high purpose in God's providence; we work indeed towards the goal of unity; but, *until* this goal is attained, we are content to abide in patience and in hope: "Heaviness may endure for a night, but joy cometh in the morning!"

And now, enough of this. Turn we from such solemn themes to the more pleasant task before us,—the critical acknowledgment of merits of the highest order. And here let us pause to say that though the name of Taylor stands with those of Tennyson



and Browning at the head of this article, we are very far from ranking the first of these three authors (as our readers may already know from earlier numbers of our "Review") with the two latter bards, whom we have recognized, and do recognize, as "*facile principes*," the undoubted chiefs of their poetic era. We have already dwelt with love on the exquisite grace and pathos of a Tennyson, on the passion and power of a Browning; and we have further acknowledged that they, with Mrs. Browning, (late Miss Barrett) may fitly be regarded as the founders of a *new school*, which, though it combines some of the elements of Wordsworth's and of Shelley's poetry, the former's simplicity and the latter's brilliancy, have yet produced effects which are altogether distinct from those of the bards just named; more substantial than Shelley, more concentrated and powerful than Wordsworth. A special mannerism, no doubt, does characterize these living exponents of the beautiful; they are addicted to the use of a certain half-German phraseology, which is not highly to be commended; they are more or less mystical in their utterances, and they very frequently barely suggest where other writers would express; they have sometimes the air of being laboured and artificial just where they have most striven to be plain and natural; they all require to be read more than once before they can be appreciated; their philosophy and religion are somewhat *dubious*. Their feelings indeed are eminently reverential, and their love for Christianity appears sincere; but their opinions would seem by no means formed, and they are more or less wanting in that moral courage, which boldly proclaims its own perception of the truth, without the remotest fear of man's censure or the age's ridicule.

We mean not to accuse these authors of a vulgar dread of *the critic*; we doubt not that they hold the anonymous assumption of infallibility, which is now in vogue, in just as much contempt as we do ourselves, and that they would just as little allow themselves to be guided by it. They would scorn themselves, no doubt, if they were *consciously* influenced by one anticipation of what the "small scribes" might say, who indite critical judgments for "*Athenæum*" or "*Examiner*." Indeed, it is more than questionable, whether *any* author has yet availed himself of a single hint given by an anonymous critic, *unless that critic was not anonymous to him!* And this, for various reasons. In the first place, there is something so monstrous in that individual assumption of infallibility and omniscience, which seems to be the invariable accompaniment of anonymous criticism, that the true poet is necessarily disgusted at starting, and irritated at every second word, yes, even by praise. Who is this anybody

or nobody, who, perhaps without a single qualification for his task, sits down to deliver a judgment which professes to be final and without appeal, on my merits,—or on the merits or demerits of a new work of “Tennyson’s?” We repeat, that this assumption of superiority, and further of infallibility, on the part of the critic, is such an insult to the understanding, such an affront to common sense, that no poet, no author of genius, would be likely to profit by the delivery, even of the wisest sentence, from such a bodiless and viewless “voice.” The fact is, that anonymous criticism, *literary* criticism that is, is altogether *a mistake*, and cannot be abandoned too soon: its only effect is to forward and realize that millennium of dulness and mediocrity, so long ago hailed by Pope and Dryden from afar: the true poet is slighted, the false is exalted, and “the public is led by the nose, as asses are.”

Why then do we *ourselves* lend our countenance and assistance to such a system? Truly, for want of a better! Since this is the appointed medium of defending truth, we must avail ourselves of it, and not let the dunces have things all their own way. Nevertheless, we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we by no means profess ourselves to be infallible; that when we differ from the authors under our consideration, and pronounce their treatment of their themes defective, it is very probable that they may have considered the subject more deeply than we, and have arrived at far juster conclusions; and further, (though this at first sight may sound almost like blasphemy,) that a poet may actually be far more *sensible*, as well as far more genial, than a Quarterly Reviewer!

We must be by no means understood to declare war to “the Anonymous,” altogether: we admit, that both in the political and theological arena of controversy, it may sometimes have its great uses; but never, we contend, in the literary.—In its general views, political or theological, any organ of the public press *may* assert for itself a quasi-infallibility: *we*, for instance, hold as an undoubted truth the essential orthodoxy of our English branch of the Church Catholic; and anonymous essays may very well be written on the assumption of such an infallibility as can be claimed for itself by any particular school of thought. But there is no such “quasi-infallibility” even, in matters of *taste*; there are no such well-defined parties there; “high church or low,” tory or whig: and Heaven be praised, that so it is! Faction has not yet divided our literary world into any two hostile armies,—such as “romanticists and classicists.” Each individual critic writes for himself, and gives his own perceptions; and what we complain of is, that in so doing he should be well-nigh *compelled* by the pre-

sent cruel system, and further, almost invariably induced, to affirm his own infallibility; and treat the author under his consideration, however superior to himself, entirely "de haut en bas;" positively condemning, it may be, the most beautiful creations of the mind, or lauding the worst of pinchbecks as true metal; (perhaps a more frequent case;) and thereby imposing on the general public; leading them to purchase works which afterwards disappoint, and so contributing powerfully to bring about a general distaste for the higher branches of literature, or possibly sealing their sight to true merit, where, trusting their own eyes and hearts, that public would not have gone astray.

These are only a tithe of the evils resulting from anonymous literary criticism: the vast temptations to *dishonesty* which it affords need only be hinted at; but its great effect is to advance and to establish the empire of *dull Conventionalism*. Under this anonymous system no man quite writes what he feels; each yields something of his own individuality of thought; nay, in nine cases out of ten, he *has* no such individuality; (few educated men have;) he judges by the current standard of the hour, and reports the result as though it were a genuine and immediate, and further, an infallible perception of his own. The final effect is, a vague uniformity of judgment, without truth, or honesty, or reality, and the consequent promotion of any one artificial mannerism, which happens to be fashionable with the writers of the hour, to exclusive empire. At the present moment, for instance, "Tennyson" is "the rage," and justly so: that is, he is the rage in literary circles at least. The consequence is, that every poet is expected to write more or less like Tennyson, and that the small critics of the day discern no merit where they do not find this Tennysonian mannerism; and where they do, are at once satisfied, however wretched may be the imitation, and so lose no time in proclaiming the advent of a new great poet. Take the instance of the self-dubbed "Sidney Gedings," whose "Roman," one of the most verbose and intolerably tedious "make-believes" we have ever striven to wade through, has been proclaimed one of the noblest productions of the century, a wonderful and glorious poem, &c.; or look at the almost equal success of the dull but well-meaning "Mackay," whose "Voices from the Crowd," and "Voices from the Mountains," and other "Voices," have elicited the most enthusiastic greetings from these said anonymous gentry. This writer, like poor "Swain," whom we dealt with briefly in our last, "apropos" of his "Reverberations," has possessed himself of certain catchwords of the present day; a species of cant which



is to us intolerably tedious, but which Tennyson nevertheless deigns sometimes to employ; respecting "the absolute perfectibility of man" in this world,—“the God in man,”—“the glorious heroic virtues of the workers and working classes,” &c., and, of course, this political and moral transcendentalist (*i. e.* Mackay), who, with the best intentions, will never write poetry as long as he lives, has been proclaimed a great poet; quite Tennysonian in style and genius, &c. &c. By the bye, his very close imitations of Tennyson in his last production, “*Egeria and other Poems*,” are absolutely comical: such harmless travesties, however, would never excite our wrath, were they not belauded by anonymous infallibility, which has succeeded and does succeed, in no small measure, in *gulling* the innocent public.

Yet the general effect of all this is, that the said public, finding itself so often taken in, gives up poetry altogether, as something no doubt fine, but unfortunately beyond the sphere of its comprehension; and thus even Tennyson himself loses three-fourths of his due readers and buyers. Poetic literature seems to be growing more and more the property of a *literary class*, and to have less and less to do with the life and heart of the nation.

No doubt, the very nature of Tennyson's genius in some measure accounts for this fact: he is not calculated, it may be, to be *popular*: and in so far as that is the case, he is *defective* as a poet: for the greatest poets, a Homer, a Shakspeare, a Schiller, a Goethe, are, as it were, the heritage of all! Still we would scarcely call Tennyson's occasional obscurity a defect; for it is oftentimes a great beauty: but, at all events, it is not to be commended as his chiefest excellence, or recommended as a fitting model for imitation. We believe and are convinced, that England,—that the human race, in fact,—has the same faculties for the love and appreciation of poetry it ever has possessed, and that a really popular poet might to-morrow find his way to the hearts of the million; might,—and yet *would not*, without *fighting* his way first, in the face of critical coldness, and the assumption on the part of the public, that he must be either nearly unintelligible,—too high for it,—or else, good for nothing!

Tennyson and Browning are great poets, and yet neither of these are really “household names,” as Byron, and Scott, and others have been: one reason is, that they are in some respects superior to Byron or Scott as poets; that they do not descend, as *they* did, to the common level; that their merits are often higher and deeper: (for generally the *highest* genius cannot be recognised at once; we like Strauss's Waltzes on the very first time of hearing, but Beethoven's Symphonies may require more than one audience; Moore's “Melodies” please a child, but

Southey's "Roderick" will only be *duly* appreciated by one who possesses a good heart and a cultivated understanding :) Tennyson and Browning have neither the merits nor the demerits of Scott and Byron,—who, however, should only be classed together, as being both in the highest degree *popular*; for Scott was as superior in artistic unity and sound sense, as he was inferior in power and passion. Our two modern bards have a language and a philosophy of their own, and display, both of them, an hitherto almost unparalleled combination of grace and pathos,—almost unparalleled we say,—for Shakspeare has shown it us before them, (he who has done all things,) in "Romeo and Juliet," in the last wonderful scene of "A Winter's Tale," in Desdemona's last conference with Emilia, in Lear and Cordelia, &c. They are, together with Mrs. Browning, pre-eminently aristocratic and refined: theirs is indeed the aristocracy of poetic genius, bordering sometimes on affectation, but rarely reaching it. No poets understand better to draw tears,—"tears," as Southey himself, a master of pathos, expresses it, "of pleasurable pain." Their colouring is rich and deep, their language is passionate, and their thoughts and feelings are pre-eminently *real*, even when exaggerated in expression. Indeed, no bards have carried farther, or so far, the combination of the simplest every-day life with the highest order of ideal poetry.

They possess, therefore, the very loftiest merits; but these are scarcely calculated to render them *popular*; and criticism, to speak generally, has done its utmost to retard their progress, whether intentionally or no. In the first place, it was right long before it discovered their respective merits at all, especially those of Tennyson and Browning. The "Quarterly," which was ready at once to laud a mediocre "Philip von Artevelde" to the skies; the "Edinburgh," which could scarcely find language to express its, if possible, still more glowing admiration for "Edwin the Fair," by the same author, and which has recently bestowed some fifty or sixty pages of laborious comment on that unfortunate abortion, Bulwer's "King Arthur," *had only scorn and ridicule, or total silence, for Tennyson for ten or twelve years*. No doubt his mannerisms did deserve reprehension, but still this lamentable incapacity to discern true poetic merit was the perfectly natural characteristic of both our *presumed* chief literary organs: now, at last, that they *have* learnt to admire, they err just as widely in the opposite direction, praising indiscriminately, and losing themselves in those vague common places, in which mediocrity always takes refuge to conceal its real deficiency of taste and judgment.

And here we may pause to observe, that after what we have

said of anonymous infallibility, this strong apparent assumption of it on *our* own part may seem "vastly entertaining;" but if we write anonymously, that is not our fault. We do not dispute besides, that a critic *may* assume the correctness of his own taste and views: all we desiderate is, that he should give his *name* at the same time to the public, as a testimony of honesty, and an unreserved confession, that, after all, what he says is only his own individual judgment. The public *will* attach a false importance to the *we*, as we said before; this *we* appears to involve omniscience and infallibility; but let an individual write ever so authoritatively with his name—after all, every body knows that *he* has just as good a right to judge for him or her self. The reader will then say,—“Well, that is the opinion of Mr. So-and-so: there seems to be something in the book he praises; at all events it is worth looking at, and I can judge for myself.” Or, if the individual critic has been severe, the reader will be apt to hum—“Indeed! but, after all, Mr. So-and-so, though he is a sensible man, is not quite infallible; so, without despising his comments, I shall read the book for myself.” Or, again he may say, “Mr. So-and-so is a fool, and I don’t care one straw for his judgment: how fortunate it is that he cannot impose on me with his high-sounding *we*! He has a plentiful vocabulary at command, and my carelessness might have allowed itself to be beguiled by his anonymous *wisdom*.” We may remark, however, that under such a system as we wish for, and *expect soon* to see,—“fools” would cease to write criticisms ere long: they would be *found out*, and would therefore creep in silence to their holes,—Grub-street orators would be hushed for ever; mediocrity would no longer dare to lay its unhallowed paw upon the crown of genius! There would be far less criticism we suspect, but, what there was, would be *definite*, and not devoid of reason. Bad works would frequently escape notice altogether; but only the good would be commended, and rising genius would be sure to be welcomed by sympathetic spirits. For there cannot be a grosser error than to imagine, that the man of genius must be envious of a brother’s greatness: true genius and envy will rarely dwell together. No doubt, false glare and glitter will often assail merit: Byron felt that his artificial tinsel could not be great poetry unless Southey’s strains were very vile indeed: two men writing on such different systems could not both be right.

But we are eminently discursive. Waiving all further introduction, let us at once approach the works before us. The first, “In Memoriam,” is a very singular production,—one continuous monody, we may say,—divided into a hundred and thirty separate strains. It is published without an author’s name, but every line, every word bears the Tennysonian impress: the whole con-



stitutes a noble monument to the graces, virtues, and powers, never destined to attain maturity, of "A. H. H." (we believe, "Arthur Henry Hallam," the son of the historian), a great friend of Tennyson's; indeed his "Pylades," or "Orestes," which you will (he recognises in his friend the higher spirit!), his college-companion, the betrothed of his sister, the sharer in all his hopes and views and youthful projects. Never has friendship been placed in a loftier and more ideal point of view: we have no doubt, by the bye, that hundreds of rhymers will begin to discover from this time forward, that they are all possessed of the dearest bosom-friends in the world! It might be presumed, that such a work, extending to pages 210, upon the same simple theme, would be monotonous: but this is scarcely the case. At least, if there be any monotony here, the monotony of sorrow, it is so eminently beautiful, that we could not wish it other than it is: but, in truth, the hopes and fears of the poet, as to a Providence and a life beyond the grave, and his general views of human life, are all embodied in this most exquisite collection; an heirloom bequeathed to our nation, and to be treasured by it, as long as the English tongue endures. This, we say, speaking generally, and recording our broad impression; but by no means implying that we imagine this work to be free from faults. Even literary faults, we think, can be discovered in it; philosophical and religious deficiencies are, alas! only too patent.

The poet commences in the dedication (written *last year*, and, therefore, some sixteen springs after the commencement of the series), by addressing himself (to all appearance, at least,) to our Blessed Lord, and imploring His forgiveness for his shortcomings. He commences (it will be observed, that he uses small letters where capitals are now *customary*):—

"Strong Son of God, immortal Love,  
Whom we, that have not seen thy face,  
By faith, and faith alone, embrace,  
Believing where we cannot prove:"

And he continues:—

"Thou seemest human and divine,  
The highest, holiest manhood, thou:  
Our wills are ours, we know not how;  
Our wills are ours, to make them thine.

Ending:—

"Forgive my grief for one removed,  
Thy creature, whom I found so fair,  
I trust he lives in thee, and there  
I find him worthier to be loved.

“Forgive these wild and wandering cries,  
 Confusions of a wasted youth;  
 Forgive them where they fail in truth,  
 And in thy wisdom make me wise.”

Is this Mr. Tennyson's deliberate faith? or are we rather to regard this prayer as the result of a poetic imagination? We know not: certain it is, that if Mr. Tennyson has mustered courage to believe at last (for courage was what was mainly wanting to him!), if he has received revelation as satisfying the highest reason, he has *then* much to answer for in publishing some of the stanzas in this collection, such a poem, for instance, as that on p. 52, commencing—

“O thou, that after toil and storm,”

in which it is most falsely, and, we may add, offensively assumed, that the unbeliever in Christianity can possess a faith of his own, quite as real and as stable as that of the believer!

We do not mean to deny that there are not common-place men of the world by thousands,—we know many such,—who can neither be said to believe nor disbelieve; who stand toward Christianity very much in the attitude of Mr. Taylor, whom we shall notice by and by; whose prevailing characteristic is a mild and dull indifferentism. These good folks, if we may so call them, derive a general sense of God's existence and His goodness from that Revelation which they nevertheless ignore, they hold these things because they have been taught them, and because it is pleasant to hold them; and as for the rest, they simply “let it go.” But there is no logical self-consistency, and no high wisdom in this course; there is merely a mild and self-sufficient selfishness; so characteristic, for instance, of the ordinary statesman of the day. Genius has nothing, or should have nothing, in common with this obtuseness of perception. To set such a “Gallio,” even the *least harmful*, intellectually above an ardent Christian, is not only an absurdity, but also a sin; and to this fact we beseech Mr. Tennyson to open his eyes. We can scarcely conceive more dangerous language than *this* of his,—more flattering to the small vanity of a very numerous class already existing among us, and more calculated to lead thousands more astray:—

“O thou, that after toil and storm,  
 Mayst *seem* to have reach'd a purer air,

(“*Seem*” indeed!—but let us go on!)

“Whose *faith* has centre every where,

(that is, *no where*,)—

“Nor *cares to fix itself to form*,—

“Leave thou thy sister, when she prays  
Her early heaven, her happy views :

(How condescending !)—

Nor thou *with shadow'd hint* confuse  
A life that leads melodious days.”

Really, we could find it in our hearts to whip this self-conceited rhymester. But we will give the last two mischievous verses without any comment :—

“Her faith thro’ form is pure *as thine*,  
Her hands are quicker unto good.  
Oh, sacred be the flesh and blood  
To which *she* links a truth divine !

“See, thou that countest *reason ripe*  
In holding by the *truth within*,  
Thou fail not in a world of sin,  
And even for want of such a type.”

Rather ten thousand-fold give us the insolent denunciations and open assaults of a Froude, than such insulting commiseration as this ! Honestly, Mr. Tennyson, what is it justifies *you* in employing such language ? Is it your own firm possession of “faith—void of form ?” *This*, at all events, does not look very much like it ! (p. 77) :—

“*So runs my dream : but what am I ?—*  
*An infant crying in the night ;*  
*An infant crying for the light :*  
*And with no language but a cry !”*

This does not *seem* the plenitude of self-contented faith and reason !

We are sorry to appear cruel, but “we are only cruel to be kind ;” and we are bound to consider the interests of many thousands of the poet’s readers. *Has Mr. Tennyson any perception of truth at all ? Does he care for truth ? Is he not an exclusive worshipper of the beautiful ?* We very much suspect it ! He appears to us to have faith or no faith, according to the poetic effect such quality, or the absence of such quality, may have upon his poetry ; not consciously perhaps, (we do not charge him with baseness,) but *really*, and as a matter of fact. Sometimes



he questions there being any life beyond the grave; *questions only*, but obviously with a doubt, as on p. 80 :—

“ And he, shall he,

“ Man, his last work, who seem'd so fair,  
Such splendid purpose in his eyes,  
Who roll'd the psalm to wintry skies,  
Who built him fanes of fruitless prayer,

“ Who trusted God was love indeed,  
And love creation's final law,—  
*Tho' nature, red in tooth and claw*  
*With ravine, shriek'd against his creed—*

“ Who loved, who suffer'd countless ills,  
Who battled for the True, the Just,—  
Be blown about the desert dust,  
Or seal'd within the iron hills?

“ No more? A monster then, a dream,  
A discord. Dragons of the prime,  
That tare each other in their slime,  
Were mellow music match'd with him.

“ O life, as futile, then, as frail!  
O for *thy* voice to soothe and bless!  
What hope of answer or redress?  
—Behind the veil, behind the veil.”

And is it for such helpless ignorance as this, to assume airs of inflated *superiority*? Ignorance, of which our author says (p. 78):—

“ I falter where I firmly trod;  
*And, falling with my weight of cares*  
*Upon the great world's altar-stairs*  
*That slope thro' darkness up to God,*

“ *I stretch lame hands,*” &c.

And which can make such a pitiable confession (p. 185, very near the end) as *this* :—

“ I *trust* I have not wasted breath:  
I *think* we are not *wholly* brain,  
*Magnetic mockeries*; not in vain,  
Like Paul with beasts, I fought with death;

“ Not *only* cunning casts in clay;—  
*Let science prove we are*, and then,  
What *matters* science unto men,  
At least to *me*?—I would not stay.

"Let him, *the wiser man*, who springs  
Hereafter, up from childhood shape  
His action like the greater ape,—  
But I was born to other things."

Is it this faint instinctive hope, trembling on the verge of despair, which is calculated to address faith after the following fashion? The poet speaks, say, to a sister (p. 142):—

"You say, but with no touch of scorn,  
Sweet-hearted, *you*, whose light-blue eyes  
Are tender over drowning flies,  
You tell me, doubt is devil-born.

"I know not : *one* indeed I knew,  
In many a subtle question versed,  
Who touch'd a jarring lyre at first,  
But ever strove to make it true :

"Perplexed in faith, but pure in deeds ;  
At last he beat his music out,  
*There lives more faith in honest doubt,*  
*Believe me, than in half the creeds."*

Now, we repeat, that such language as this is infinitely mischievous. Such things are caught up as the catchwords of unbelievers, and go very far towards justifying them in their own esteem in their vanity and folly. No doubt there *may* be honest doubters, and there *are* hypocritical believers; but the assumption here seems to be, that doubt is almost of necessity a more honest thing than faith! Another very mischievous poem is that on p. 56, commencing,—

"Tho' truths in manhood darkly join,  
Deep-seated in our mystic frame,  
We yield all blessing to the name  
Of him that made them current coin."

That is, of course, of Christ our Lord. This is simply and purely blasphemy! This is the tone of "Emerson" and his "*confrères*;" the tone which Browning, in the admirable poem we shall deal with anon, alludes to, and dismisses so contemptuously. We might quote more to the same effect, but refrain. In other passages the dreams of the author of "*Vestiges of Creation*" seem to be realized and accepted by the poet, who says, addressing humanity, with reference to its earliest age:—

"Arise and fly  
The reeling fawn, the sensual feast :  
Move upward, *working out the beast,*  
*And let the ape and tiger die."*

But now let us leave this painful theme. We remain undecided as to Mr. Tennyson's faith, though we opine, that, strictly speaking, *he has none*, whether negative or affirmative, and advise him, for his soul's good, to try to get one! Let us now deal with the exquisite *poetical* beauties of the volume before us.

Mr. Tennyson is not a showy, not a gaudy, poet: he does not carry you by storm; his strain rather creeps gently into the heart, and awakens there a low and long resounding echo. We are rarely dazzled by him at first sight; he has few tulips to exhibit (though, if he likes, he can be gorgeous also), but his violets are wonderfully blue and sweet, and breathe forth such a delicious, though somewhat lingering, fragrance, that they seem to the beholder the very quintessence of all flowers. Here is a *theme*, which, treated by any other poet, would have been mawkish, nay, insupportable: but, treated by Tennyson, we are captivated, we are enchanted, almost against our wills: we think it at last the most natural of occurrences to write a hundred and thirty poems to the memory of one youthful friend.

Perhaps, the very unpassionateness of friendship, in a sense, may make this a subject well adapted for elegiac poetry: the friend seems to have leisure and ability to sound the depths of his loss, to measure the value of the lost one. The blindness and excess of mere passion are not here: the grief felt is real and deep; but it is not so violent and unutterable as *some* griefs, which would scarcely suffer such poetic contemplation. However this may be, we wish to moralize no longer, but to treat, for some little space, of the exquisite beauties before us.

To begin *seriatim*, the opening poems appear to us at present a little mystic and hard of comprehension: we may instance especially, No. III.; but V. is very natural and striking. We will quote it, though it is not precisely one of our favourites. We fear this language may seem very *hard-hearted* to the poet, dealing after this literary fashion with his heart's emotions; we cannot help it; we respect, we most sincerely respect, his feelings; but *we* have to deal with the poet, rather than with the man, and must act accordingly:—

## V.

“ I sometimes hold it half a sin  
     To put in words the grief I feel;  
     For words, like nature, half reveal  
     And half conceal the mind within.

“ But, for the unquiet heart and brain,  
     A use in measured language lies;  
     *The sad mechanic exercise*  
     *Like dull narcotics, numbing pain.*



“ In words, like weeds, I’ll wrap me o’er  
 Like coarsest clothes against the cold ;  
 But that large grief which these enfold  
 Is given in outline, and no more.”

(The italics throughout, we may observe, will be ours, as indicating what *we* consider “beauties.”) The next, No. VI., is exceedingly beautiful, on the common topics of consolation, and their vanity. There is no bereaved one who has not felt the truth of the poet’s comment. No. VIII. is also admirable. We quote only the last two verses, for lack of space:—

“ So seems it in my deep regret,  
 O my forsaken heart, with thee,  
 And this poor flower of *poesy*,  
 Which, little cared for, fades not yet.

“ But, since it pleased a vanish’d eye,  
 I go to plant it on his tomb,  
 That, if it can, it there may bloom ;  
 Or, dying there, at least may die !”

Then follow several very poetical addresses to “the ship,” bearing young “Arthur’s” remains from a foreign strand,—as we afterwards learn, “Vienna,”—to be buried in his native soil. Most admirable in its keen truthfulness is No. XIV., where the poet declares, that if the report were brought him that the ship had touched the land, if he went down to the harbour, and saw his dead friend stepping from the vessel, striking “a sudden hand” in his, asking “a thousand things of home,”—he “should not feel it to be strange !” It is long, indeed, before the heart *realizes* the loss of one who has perished at a distance and unexpectedly. He is brought to England. He is buried near the Severn and the Wye. The cold white monument is raised to his memory. Then, finally, the poet sings :—

“ I sing to him that rests below,  
 And, since the grasses round me wave,  
 I take the grasses of the grave,  
 And make them pipes whereon to blow.

“ The traveller hears me now and then,  
 And sometimes harshly will he speak ;  
 ‘ This fellow would make weakness weak,  
 And melt the waxen hearts of men.’

“ Another answers, ‘ Let him be,  
 He loves to make parade of pain,  
 That with his piping he may gain  
 The praise that comes to constancy.’

" A third is wroth, ' Is this an hour  
For private sorrow's barren song,  
When more and more the people throng  
The chairs and thrones of civil power ?

" A time to sicken and to swoon,  
When conscience reaches forth her arms,  
To feel from world to world, and charms  
Her secret from the latest moon ?'—

" Behold, ye speak an idle thing :  
Ye never knew the sacred dust :  
I do but sing because I must,  
And pipe but as the linnets sing :

" And unto one her note is gay,  
For now her little ones have ranged ;  
And unto one her note has changed,  
Because her brood is stolen away."

We have given this at full, not so much for its poetic merit, (though it has much,) as because it is the poet's apology for his series ; and it was fitting we should let him speak for himself : but we must be more cautious with our citations in future. Nevertheless the next poem, XXII., tempts us so much, that we must needs extract it.

" The path by which we twain did go,  
Which led by tracts that pleased us well,  
Thro' four sweet years arose and fell  
From flower to flower, from snow to snow :

" And we with singing cheer'd the way ;  
And, crown'd with all the season lent,  
From April on to April went,  
And glad at heart from May to May :

" But where the path we walk'd began  
To slant the fifth autumnal slope,  
As we descended, following hope,  
*There sat the shadow fear'd of man ;*

" Who broke our fair companionship,  
And spread his mantle dark and cold :  
*And wrapt thee formless in the fold,*  
*And dull'd the murmur on thy lip,*

" And bore thee where I could not see,  
Nor follow, tho' I walk in haste ;  
*And think that, somewhere in the waste,*  
*The shadow sits, and waits for me."*

The sad horror of this has rarely been surpassed. Beautiful are the various "Christmas" poems: the three of the first year are exquisite,—the first beginning "The time draws near the birth of Christ,"—together with XXIX. and XXX.; especially the latter, anent the Christmas songs and games. Then follow two beautiful sections or tablets, (whatever they may be called,) on Lazarus and his sister: the second of these is most exquisite and *pious*: but, as if afraid of what he has written, the poet hastens in the obnoxious XXXIII. already quoted at full, beginning—

"O thou, that after toil and storm,"

to undo whatever good he may have thus accomplished. Then follow several melancholy doubting sonnets, the tone of which has been already condemned: the poet at last appears conscience-stricken, and at last arraigns himself under the form of a reprimand, addressed by "Urania" to his "Melpomene" in XXXVII., where we learn accidentally that these were the views of his departed friend, who would appear to have been rather characterized by a delightfully genial temperament than by any genius of a high order. Most exquisite is No. XXXIX., though too long for quotation, replete with that sweet quiet pathos, in which Tennyson is perhaps without an equal. Some compartments of the poem follow in which the bard dwells on the mental superiority of his friend to himself, a superiority in which we cannot very thoroughly believe.

"I vex my heart with fancies dim :  
He still outstript me in the race," &c. (p. 64.)

Very fine is LIII. :—

"Oh yet we trust that some how good,"

ending with a verse we have already cited, proclaiming the poet's helplessness. Many of the work's sections hereabouts are bitter, and dark with doubt. LVIII. is very sweet and touching. Still more so, perhaps, is LXII., which we shall quote accordingly. The poet addresses his friend's spirit :—

"Dost thou look back on what hath been,—  
As some divinely-gifted man,  
Whose life in low estate began,  
And on a simple village green ;  
"Who breaks his birth's invidious bar,  
And grasps the skirts of happy chance,  
And breasts the blows of circumstance,  
And grapples with his evil star ;



- “ Who makes by force his merit known,  
 And lives to clutch the golden keys,  
 To mould a mighty state's decrees,  
*And shape the whisper of the throne ;*
- “ And moving up from high to higher,  
 Becomes on fortune's crowning slope  
 The pillar of a people's hope,  
 The centre of a world's desire,
- “ Yet feels, as in a pensive dream,  
 When all his active powers are still,  
*A distant dearness in the hill,  
 A secret sweetness in the stream,*
- “ The limit of his narrower fate,—  
*While yet beside its vocal springs  
 He play'd at counsellors and kings,  
 With one that was his earliest mate :—*
- “ *Who ploughs with pain his native lea,  
 And reaps the labours of his hands,  
 Or in the furrow musing stands,  
 ' Does my old friend remember me ?' ”*

This is exceedingly beautiful, though we cannot but think the poet rates himself too low, and his friend too high: however, to true affection this may easily be forgiven. A very singular strain is that headed LXVII., commencing,—

“ I dream'd there would be spring no more,”

wherein is a species of allegory: the poet describes himself as wreathing a crown of thorns around his brow, by which he types, we presume, this series of sad and sorrowful pipings; the world calls him “ the fool that wears a crown of thorns; ” but an angel touches it into leaf, and breathes a mystic blessing. This is very admirable of its kind, and will, it is to be hoped, operate as a warning voice to the vulgar, especially the vulgar *critic*, not to meddle with what he does not understand! Very beautiful is LXXIII., beginning,—

“ I leave thy praises unexpress'd,”

an assertion, however, with regard to his lost, and, no doubt, much-loved friend, which our poet is scarcely justified in making. This poem concludes most nobly:—

- “ Thy leaf has perish'd in the green ;  
 And, while we breathe beneath the sun,  
 The world, which credits what is done,  
 Is cold to all that might have been !

“ So here shall silence guard thy fame ;  
*But somewhere, out of human view,*  
*Whate'er thy hands are set to do*  
*Is wrought with tumult of acclaim.”*

Our poet's friend would seem to have been pre-eminently destined for a *worker*: he is described (p. 174) as likely to become,—

“ A life in civic action warm,  
 A soul on highest mission sent,  
*A potent voice of Parliament,*  
 A pillar steadfast in the storm.”

Another sweet Christmas memory follows on p. 106. The next, No. LXXVII., is a very graceful and tender apology to a brother, for an expression dropped before, “More than my brothers are to me;” concluding,—

“ At one dear knee we proffer'd vows,  
 One lesson from one book we learn'd,  
 Ere childhood's flaxen ringlet turn'd  
 To black and brown on kindred brows.

“ And so my wealth *resembles* thine ;  
 But *he* was rich where *I* was poor,  
 And he supplied my want the more  
 As his unlikeness fitted mine.”

But truly, we must close our citations: we have exquisite reminiscences of past happiness in the family circle when the lost one was present; one charming memory of college, LXXXV.; another touching series on the departure of the poet and his family from their native home or dwelling; and one most lovely and pathetic poem on a learned and talented husband and his admiring wife, (pp. 144, 145,) perhaps, poetically, the most perfect thing in the book, but it is too long for extraction. One exquisite portraiture of the lost “Arthur” we must however add to our citations. It forms the No. CVIII.:—

“ Thy converse drew us with delight,  
 The men of rathe and riper years ;  
*The feeble soul, a haunt of fears,*  
*Forgot his weakness in thy sight.*

“ On thee the loyal-hearted hung,  
*The proud was half disarm'd of pride,*  
 Nor cared the serpent at thy side  
 To flicker with *his* treble tongue.

" *The stern were mild when thou wert by,  
The flippant put himself to school  
And heard thee ; and the brazen fool  
Was soften'd, and he knew not why.*

" While I, thy dearest, sat apart,  
And felt thy triumph was as mine ;  
And loved them more, that they were thine,  
The graceful tact, the Christian art ;

" Not mine the sweetness or the skill,  
But mine the love that will not tire ;  
And, born of love, the vague desire  
That spurs an imitative will."

And now let us quote no more, though several of the remaining poems are also most beautiful. The epilogue, respecting the marriage of a younger sister of the poet, a child at the period of his friend's decease, is very exquisite, and will be felt by many, perhaps, as much if not more than any thing else in the volume : it is full of a happy, and we might almost say, a holy pathos, which melts on the heart like dew. And so we bid this work farewell. Much, much, remains to say concerning it ; but we have no space for further comments. We must add, however, that it is scarcely possible not to think, that the existence of "Shakspeare's Sonnets" in some measure prompted the poet to the composition of his work : he has furnished them with a full worthy counterpart. One magnificent strain we have omitted to notice, on the bells ringing *out* the old, and *in* the new year : we are sorry to find it conclude with an expression, which *may* be interpreted as an endeavour to swell the cry of Carlyle, and Emerson, and "George Sand," and so many others for the future Antichrist ; namely, "Ring in *the Christ that is to be* ;" but one verse should be cited for the sake of its mournful modesty :—

" Ring out the want, the care, the sin,  
The faithless coldness of the times :  
*Ring out, ring out, my mournful rhymes,*  
But ring the fuller minstrel in."

He may long delay his coming : yet such a minstrel there no doubt *may be* ; for, as we observed before, despite the really exquisite beauty of much of his writing, Mr. Tennyson will always be a *class poet* ; he will never be *very generally popular*. Then, too, he *teaches* us nothing ; he needs teaching himself ; he is rather an exponent of this age's wants, than one who can in any measure undertake to satisfy them. And yet, with all this, we repeat, he is a great poet ; and great he for ever will remain.



Turn we now to Robert Browning and his new creation. This is a wildly fantastic composition, powerful, earnest, in part devotional, yet audacious, and Hudibrastically satirical. In "Christmas-Eve and Easter-Day" Mr. Browning is understood to have expressed his religious convictions, and to have yielded on the whole his adherence to dogmatic Christianity as "the truth." That his manner of expression is strangely grotesque cannot be questioned; that his speculations are bold in the extreme nobody will deny. Nevertheless, he indicates in the first division of this poem his faith in Christianity *as a fact*, and in the second he expresses his sense of the necessity for loving God in Christ better than this world. The whole poem may be said to consist of two visions and their introductions; in the one of which the poet follows our Lord alternately to St. Peter's at Rome, and the lecture-room of a German Professor; he accepting literally the promise, "When two or three are gathered together," &c.; while in the other he witnesses the last judgment, and is condemned himself to enjoy this world, with no hope of any thing beyond it for ever and ever, for having preferred it to his God. This groundwork is certainly most *bizarre*, and the poem contains some even wilder things than these, which we can scarcely pause to indicate; but how much of deep thought and genuine feeling, what quiet yet earnest scorn for the mythical school of unbelievers, what concentrated power, and originality of execution shall we find here!

At the commencement the poet finds himself in a dissenting chapel, having been driven thither by a storm of wind and rain on the great Easter-Eve; there he falls asleep, under the infliction of a pulpit Boanerges, and imagines in his dream that he leaves the chapel, sees our Lord issuing from it, and follows Him, first to St. Peter's, then elsewhere, as has been already indicated. The description of the meeting-house, "Mount Zion Chapel," is most admirable; the arrival, or dropping in of the congregation, one by one, is touched with a master-hand. How graphic is this—

"Well,—from the road, the lanes or the common,  
In came the flock:—*the fat weary woman,*  
*Panting and bewilder'd, down-clapping*  
*Her umbrella with a mighty report,*  
*Grounded it by me, wry and flapping,*  
*A wreck of whalebones."*

This in its way can scarcely be surpassed. Then the arrival of this poor child of sin:—

"A female something past me flitted,

\* \* \* \*

And it seem'd the very door-hinge pitied  
All that was left of a woman once,  
Holding, at least, its tongue for the nonce."

The poet's own resolve to step in at last—he is all this time waiting outside in the vestibule for the storm—is most characteristically indicated. The flock gives him angry supercilious glances in passing, or he imagines as much:—

"There was no standing it much longer,—  
'Good folks,' said I, as resolve grew stronger,—  
'This way you perform the grand inquisitor  
When the weather sends you a chance visitor?—  
You are the men, and wisdom shall die with you,  
And none of the old seven churches vie with you."

But he goes in at last, and graphically does he describe the preacher's style, and the delight of the congregation:—

"The flock sat on, *divinely fluster'd*."

This passage is, we think, inimitable:—

"My old fat woman *purr'd with pleasure*,  
And thumb round thumb went twirling faster,  
While she, to his periods keeping measure,  
*Maternally devour'd* the pastor."

Well, he imagines he leaves the chapel, emerging on the heath or common some where near London. Much admirable matter follows of a reflective order, though strangely expressed. The power of man to grieve or glorify God,

"As a mere machine could never do,"

is asserted: his consequent *separation* from God, and yet the need of God's love in him to accomplish any thing. Then, after a fanciful account of a gigantic lunar rainbow, which attracts the poet's attention, our Lord is seen by him as coming from the chapel.

"All at once I look'd up with terror.  
He was there.  
He Himself with His human air  
On the narrow pathway, just before;  
I saw the back of Him, no more—  
He had left the chapel, then, as I!

\* \* \* \*

My mind fill'd with the cataract,  
At one bound, of the mighty fact."

How finely said ! The poet describes himself as pressing to "the salvation of His vest," striving to touch the border of His garment, and being hurried after Him in a rapid mystical flight, across land and ocean, to the gate of St. Peter's at Rome ; all which is strangely but grandly told. Graphically portrayed is St. Peter's, where our Lord enters in this vision, but the poet does not : he fears to be confused by the idolatry within : he tells us, Deity might transcend all minor errors, where faith and love were present ; but he, "a mere man," could not, must fear to quit the clue God had given him. Yet, on consideration, he half doubts whether he ought not to enter ; whether for *him*, too, love should not obscure the presence of error :—

" I see the error ; but, above  
The scope of error, see the love."

Here follows a fine passage commencing,—

" Oh, love of those first Christian days !"

on the apparent contempt shown by the early Christians for Pagan art and Pagan beauty ; over which we know not whether to rejoice or mourn.

" Love, with Greece and Rome in ken,  
Bade her scribes abhor the trick  
Of poetry and rhetoric,  
And exult, with hearts set free,  
In blessed imbecility  
Scrawl'd, perchance, on some torn sheet,  
Leaving Livy incomplete."

\*       \*       \*       \*

" Love was the startling thing, the new ;  
Love was the all-sufficient too."

At last our Lord re-issues ; and now He wends His course, followed by our poet, to some "tall, old, quaint, irregular town," a university town of Germany ;—

" It may be Göttingen,—most likely."

And there, to a lecture-hall, where a body of students are assembled on this same Easter-Eve, to listen to a mythical rationalistic lecture on our Lord and Christianity. The professor is described most graphically : his lecture, or what is given of it, is a perfect epitome of the common-places of the now fashionable transcendental infidelity, which Browning deals with unsparingly. *The myth* of Christ and its origin is dilated on ; how His word and tradition,—



“ Though it meant  
 Something entirely different  
 From all, *that those who only heard it*  
*In their simplicity thought and averr'd it,*  
 Had yet a meaning quite as respectable !”

Rather a home-thrust this, O transcendentalists! Then the professor comes to the main upshot of this twaddle: “ Was he,” that is, CHRIST,—

“ *Was He not surely the first to insist on  
 The natural sovereignty of our race ?*”

which detested cant wears out at last our poet's patience, and drives him from the lecture-hall to ruminate on what he has listened to. The mingled contempt and pity of the ensuing passage make it one of the most *telling* imaginable against the follies of infidelity. Clearly the poet shows, that if Christ's divinity be rejected, nothing virtually is left; for as to mere morality, that is admitted and proclaimed on other hands without the addition, that—

“ He, the sage and humble,  
*Was also one with the Creator !*”

Powerfully and unanswerably the poet proceeds:—

“ You urge Christ's followers' simplicity :  
 But how does shifting blame evade it ?  
 Have wisdom's words no more felicity ?  
 The stumbling-block, His speech—who laid it ?  
 How comes it, that for one found able  
 To sift the truth of it from fable,  
 Millions believe it to the letter ?”

Ay, *how*, indeed ? How were the Evangelists deluded, the Apostles blinded, and the whole world *taken in* by such a gigantic unreality ? There is but one answer. *They never were !* Browning goes on to tell us, that if Christ our Lord were man only, he should protest against all Socinian worship of Him : honoured He then might be as the Shakspeare of theology, but nothing more.

“ I would call such a Christ our Saint,  
 As I declare our poet, him  
 Whose insight makes all others dim.”

But it is not new moral truths of which man needed or needs the communication, so much as—

“ *A motive and injunction,*  
 For practising what we know already ;”

And this the poet concludes accordingly was "the real God-function!" Finely he continues,—

"And such an injunction and such a motive  
As the God in Christ, do you waive, and 'heady,  
High-minded,' hang your tablet-votive  
Outside the fane on a finger-post?"

Again:—

"What is the point where Himself lays stress?  
Does the precept run, 'Believe in good,  
In justice, truth, now understood  
For the first time?—or, 'Believe in ME,  
Who lived and died, yet essentially  
Am Lord of life?"

This again is, we need not say, unanswerable. But the poet's scorn rises yet higher at the pretended admiration with which the rationalist or mythical misinterpreter *calls on us to take back our faith*, when he has made dust and ashes of it, and honour it as much as ever!

"'Go home, and venerate the myth  
I thus have experimented with—  
This Man, continue to adore him,  
Rather than all who went before him,  
And all who ever followed after?'—  
*Surely for this I may praise you, my brother!  
Will you take the praise in tears or laughter?"*

And further on:—

"But still, when you rub the brow meticulous,  
And ponder the profit of turning holy,  
If not for God's, for your own sake solely,—  
*God forbid, I should find you ridiculous!!*"

Certainly, the force of scornful pity can no further go. After some very far-reaching reflections on the apparent benefits of toleration and the need for some real creed, the poet follows our Lord again, as he imagines, back to the chapel from which he started, when his waking is well described. Strange to say, Browning has here thought fit to intimate his preference of some or any form of dissent to the teaching of the Church of England, or of any *Church*: thus we presume that we are to understand him, where he says:—

"My heart does best to receive in meekness  
This mode of worship, as most to His mind,  
Where earthly aids being cast behind,

His all in all appears serene  
With the thinnest human veil between !”

And yet we believe, we almost know, that our author has been throughout life a member of our Church Communion. Is this a mere freak of genius, or how are we to understand it? Some of the concluding reflections of the first part are very striking, as, for instance, where the poet says of the poor German Professor, whom he has described as apparently dying of a slow consumption :—

“ When thicker and thicker, the darkness fills  
The world through his misty spectacles,  
And he gropes *for something more substantial*  
Than a fable, myth, or personification,—  
May Christ do for him what no mere *man* shall,  
And stand confess’d as the God of salvation !”

Finally the poet says, vindicating the style and method of this poem,

“ If any blames me,  
Thinking that merely to touch in brevity  
The topics I dwell on were unlawful,—  
Or, worse, that I trench with undue levity  
On the bounds of the holy and the awful,—  
*I praise the heart, and pity the head of him,*  
*And refer myself to Thee instead of him ;*  
Who head and heart alike discernest,  
Looking below light speech we utter,  
*When the frothy spume and frequent sputter*  
*Prove that the soul’s depths boil in earnest !”*

And now we have allowed Mr. Browning to speak much for himself ; and, we think, to some effect. Of the second part, “ Easter-Day,” we can only say that it is wilder again than the first, more poetic it may be, and grander ; the description of the final conflagration in the vision of the last day is truly magnificent and awful,—and that it deals with a most difficult subject, the degree to which asceticism should enter into the life of the true Christian. Our poet almost seems to imagine that he should give up the use of this world altogether, and to condemn himself because he cannot consent to do this. He states the ascetic argument derived from the death of Christ our Lord, as strongly as it *can* be stated, in the passage commencing :—

“ Enough ! you know  
The all-stupendous tale,—that birth,  
That life, that death !”



and appears to imagine the said argument incontrovertible; on which point we differ from him. We think, and know, that the use of this world is permitted to the Christian, yes, even to him who aims at perfection; after which all indeed are bound to strive, and not an isolated class. But, as a whole, this second part is far less satisfactory to us than the first: we think it founded, to a great degree, on a mistake. This is not the place, however, at the fag-end of a long literary article, in which we could enter into such a controversy. Much there is, no doubt, that is very admirable here, too, in this second part of the poems: and powerfully does the poet demonstrate, that earth without the hope of heaven would only be a wilderness.

On the whole, however, this contribution of Browning's to our poetic literature is a great work, and is gladly hailed by us as such. Essentially different as it is in all respects from "In Memoriam," they are both destined to an earthly immortality.

And now turn we to the Lepidus of this triumvirate, the unhappy Taylor: how sadly does he halt after his giant-brethren! But it is our fault for placing him in a false position. "The words of Mercury are harsh after the songs of Apollo." But, decidedly "the Virgin Widow" is no word of Mercury's even: it is a weak, colourless, poverty-stricken imitation of the inferior class of Elizabethan dramas; a kind of tragi-comedy; but the tragedy has no pathos, and the comedy no mirth. It bears in fact about the same relation to a true drama, which a stalking-horse does to a battle-courser. In the opening acts there is a certain amount of mellifluous gentle dulness, which is not displeasing; but as the play advances the total absence of creative power or dramatic sympathy becomes only too evident. The hero, as is usual with Mr. Taylor, is one of the dullest of the dull: his quiet indifference when deprived of his worshipped lady-love, where his quixotic friend offers to speak in his behalf, is positively comic. There is no true movement, no internal development of characters from first to last, not a spark of dramatic life, or even of *intention*.

We speak so gravely and severely, because some of the leading critical organs of this country go on to shout an "Io Pœan," after each fresh failure on the part of Mr. Taylor to realize his ideal; not that we believe he *has* an ideal strictly speaking. Isolated passages in "the Virgin Widow," are not altogether devoid of poetic merit; dramatic, as aforesaid, they have none: one or two little songs introduced, though they are only echoes of Elizabethan ditties, are rather pleasing in their way: the opening scenes are more bearable than Mr. Taylor's tragedies generally, because less pretentious; but, as a whole, "the Virgin Widow" is as weak as possible.

We confess that we have a grudge against this writer, moral as well as literary: we could pass over his absurdly exaggerated praises of Wordsworth in the "Quarterly:" we can appreciate the ethical and common-sense value of some of his reflections: but we can never forgive the composition of the "Statesman;" a work which we believe to have done more harm to rising politicians, to the statesmen of the age generally, than any other contribution to literature which could be named; to have done more harm therefore indirectly to our Church and country. Therein Mr. Taylor, under all manner of specious pretences, does not scruple to justify *dissimulation* and *falsehood*, necessity being of course the tyrant plea; he warns young statesmen not to form any connexions which cannot be *useful* to them, and not to express opinions strongly, lest they should be *hampered* in official life, and not enabled to follow the courses of expediency; he advises them to make a habit of speaking at debating societies *against their real convictions*, that they may so acquire a habit for future use in Parliament; he declares generally, that a great statesman should have few strong convictions, and should rather be the exponent and representative, than the guide of the public mind: in fact, all the philosophy of worldly false expediency, and of conventional mediocrity, is condensed under the most fair-seeming exterior in this mischievous little work, to which we probably owe more of moral and political evil than can easily be estimated; so great an authority has Mr. Taylor become, more especially with our *moderate Conservatives*! Christianity he ignores, lays altogether on one side, and so provides us with a wretched ethical substitute of lax morality. In nothing great or good does he believe! His work is essentially of the "Taper" and "Tadpole" order, and we believe it to be only too fair an embodiment of the man and of the school.

How then should such a thinker be a poet? Nay, the greatest poet and dramatist of the day, as "Quarterly" and "Edinburgh" inform us? For our part, we like better even the bold wickedness of a Byron, against which Mr. Taylor declaims so loudly, than this washed-out, colourless, official prose and poetry, void of sense or of soul, a vague Wordsworthian philosophising, taking the place of religion, the very cant of respectability, the sublime of dulness. Ten thousand-fold rather would we deal with an open foe than with such half-and-half friends as these: we wish for no such allies: we protest against the *Christianity* of such writers as the vaguest of unrealities; and we maintain, that such a school could no more produce a *great poet*, than Thuggism could rear a blessed saint. Its nature, at best, is to be flat, dull, level, *essentially prosaic*.

We have no space for extracts from "the Virgin Widow" to prove the justice of our charges: where uniform dulness and deadness is the characteristic, single flagrant errors need not be sought for: it seems better to abstain from citations; and, besides, we have exhausted our space. "Quarterly" and "Edinburgh" may, and probably will, devote a long article each to "the Virgin Widow," but it is destined to speedy and certain oblivion: they may neglect Tennyson's "In Memoriam;" (though this is not probable *now*! even dulness has acknowledged *him*!) they will certainly pass by Browning's new creation disregardingly; yet these two works will live, when a much-belauded "Philip von Artevelde" (not to speak of "the Virgin Widow") is buried in "the tomb of all the Capulets." Pretentious mediocrity may run, or seem to run, cheek by jowl with genius for a while, nay, may altogether outrun it; but there is a quagmire on its path, into which, sooner or later, it must sink: may it rest in peace!

---



ART. V.—*An Appeal to the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, to combine for the Defence of the Church, and for the Recovery of her Rights and Liberties.* By GEORGE ANTHONY DENISON, M.A., Vicar of East Brent. London: Rivingtons. 1850.

THAT the Church of England requires liberty in order to execute her work, is a truth to which considerable numbers of her more intelligent members are beginning to be alive. It is true that as yet there is no movement on a large scale for the restoration of Church liberties: for Churchmen are as yet very imperfectly organized, and they have no recognized leader, and they are for the most part timid and uncertain in their movements, not feeling their course traced out with sufficient distinctness for them; and, not least, they are still, to a very considerable extent, subject to impressions, notions, and influences derived from the system under which the Church has been enslaved, and all of which tend to prolong the reign of that system. Nevertheless, there is light breaking in on all sides: men are investigating things as they are, and have been; they are learning to think for themselves, and to act with those who agree with them; they are learning how to associate for the redress of grievances, and how to proceed without the aid and countenance of persons of rank and station, and even when such persons discourage and condemn them.

All this affords satisfactory evidence of the preparation which is being made for the great struggle for liberty. The Hampden controversy and the Gorham controversy have shown Churchmen how powerless they are, under the existing laws, to check the inroads of heresy. These two cases have shown the State to be at once without religious belief, and without toleration for the consciences of Churchmen. They have set before us the claims of a temporal power, which believes no doctrine, to dictate on matters of doctrine to the Church; and they have shown that the law supports these claims through its ministers. Great as are the evils arising from such cases, we are yet indebted to them for a clearer view of our actual condition. Many Churchmen had been under the persuasion that the laws of the land protected the faith of the English Church, while they granted toleration to other religious communions; and that the State did not possess legally the power of imposing on the Church a bishop who did

not hold her creed, or of intruding men of unsound faith into her parochial benefices. These points are now no longer doubtful : a bishop censured for unsound doctrine, contrary to that of the English Church, has been forced into one of her sees ; a priest has similarly been intruded into a parochial benefice ; and the State has asserted throughout its absolute and irresponsible power, —the power of nominating whomsoever it pleases, without reference to his belief or other qualifications.

Without doubt the statesmen and jurists who have of late claimed such absolute powers for the State and the Legislature in all respects, are, to a certain extent, in the right. Every one must admit the *legal* omnipotence of the supreme legislative body, consisting of Queen, Lords, and Commons. As far as the law is concerned, as far as civil rights are concerned, there is nothing that Parliament cannot do. It may confiscate all estates, may abolish the national debt, may close all churches, chapels, and meeting-houses in the empire, and throw their ministers into prison, or cut off their heads. It may legalize incest, adultery, fornication, blasphemy, and irreligion, and may award prizes to the best proficient in any given vice. It may, in the same way, create bishops and priests, directing them to be ordained by the Secretary of State, or not to be ordained at all. It may place such bishops in possession of Church property, and recognize their ecclesiastical jurisdiction as the only jurisdiction sanctioned by law. It may require the license and ordination of such bishops as essential pre-requisites to the possession of benefices in the Church. It may abolish subscriptions to creeds and articles of faith, and enact penalties against any clergyman who should refuse to administer the sacrament to Dissenters, Jews, Mahomedans, or Pagans. All this the Legislature may do. It may even go beyond this, and require from every member of the community the worship of the reigning sovereign as a deity, or the adoration of Juggernaut, if it pleases.

All this the Legislature might do in its absolute sovereignty. States have before now enacted laws exactly of this description, and most rigorously enforced them. And, again, no one will deny the power of the Legislature to set aside the law of nations, as it is called. The Legislature might, if it chose so to do, decapitate all the foreign ambassadors in England, and might annex to the British dominions by force any of the neighbouring possessions of other powers, without their consent.—And could these acts be carried into effect, they would, if the British Legislature willed it, be perfectly *legal*.

Thus there is, in one sense, perfect truth in the statesman's and the barrister's principle, of the omnipotence of the law. The State *can* do as it pleases in theory. But there is another point

of view in which legislation may be considered ; there is such a thing as *unjust* legislation, there is such a thing as tyrannical and oppressive law. The law may be opposed to the revealed will of God, to the injunctions of conscience. When Christians were required by law, and on penalty of death, to sacrifice to false gods, the law was unjust and tyrannical. It was equally so, in the opinion of many persons, when penal enactments were in force against Romanists and Dissenters. It was perfectly legal to burn heretics till the reign of Charles II., yet those who acted on the law in that respect are now regarded as monsters of cruelty. In short, the Legislature, though perfectly absolute in theory, can enact laws, which are as unjust, cruel, and unrighteous, as any acts of individuals can possibly be.

And now to apply what has been said to a particular case. The Church of England is, at this time, labouring under oppressive and unjust laws in many respects. In the first place it is a most unjust law, however it may have originated, which gives to bodies and persons alien from the faith of the Church of England the power of regulating her doctrine and discipline, her worship and her endowments, at pleasure. The Church of England is not, like other religious communities, subject strictly to the regulation and guidance of her own members : she is subject to be interfered with by bodies and persons who do not agree with her in faith, but whose object is to injure her in all ways and to destroy her. She is subject to the legislation of Dissenters, Roman Catholics, and Infidels, or persons of no creed. We do not stop to inquire how this has been brought about : it was not *always* so. All we mean to say is, that this state of things is a crying and monstrous injustice. We care not by what theories statesmen or divines may seek to justify it. There can be no excuse for so gross a violation of the commonest principles of justice and religious liberty. Is it possible to justify such a state of the law as gives to persons of one creed the power of acting as rulers and directors of a creed to which they are opposed ? Romanists and Dissenters do not believe the system of the Church of England to be true : they are bound by their own principles to seek the destruction of that system ; and yet the law of the land invests them with the power of legislating for it !

On the other hand, the State has exempted all Dissenters and Roman Catholics from interference with their religious concerns by persons of other religious denominations. The Romanists can hold their synods without any admixture of other religionists, and arrange all their own doctrine and discipline. Dissenters are equally exempt from interference in their affairs. Parliament, and the Crown, leave them to act as they judge advisable. The Church of England, alone, is deprived, by the arbitrary power of



the executive, of her constitutional right of settling her own affairs in her synods ; and the temporal Legislature, composed in part of Romanists, Dissenters, Infidels, and persons of no creed, has usurped the right of being the sole legislature in Church matters. We say it has "usurped" the power, because it has assumed it without the consent of the Church, and in consequence of the arbitrary suspension of the Church's true legislature. The case is strictly parallel to that of Charles I. in attempting to dispense with Parliament. In the seventeenth century the Crown usurped the powers of both Houses of Parliament, and in the nineteenth the Temporal Legislature usurps the powers of the Church Legislature.

In fact, it would be just as reasonable and fair for the law to compel Churchmen to listen in their churches to Roman Catholic or Dissenting preachers, as to give to persons of a different creed the power of interfering in legislation for the Church, as under the present system.

It is a great injustice to give persons of a different creed the power of interfering in the concerns of the Church, when the members of the Church are excluded from all interference in the religious concerns of the creed professed by such persons. It is, in fact, to give the preference to other denominations above the Church—to give them rights and immunities which are refused to the Church. On what principle of justice and fairness is it possible to justify such inequality in the mode of dealing with the Church and with other religious bodies ?

It may be said in answer to this, as it often is said, that the sects have not been endowed by the State, but the Church *has* been ; and therefore the State has a right, in return, to regulate all the affairs of the Church. But this proceeds on an assumption which is untrue ; because the State never *did* endow the Church, the property of the Church taking its origin from its own regulations, and from the gifts of its members, and the State having done nothing more than confirm what it found already in force, or protected the conveyance of property for religious purposes, as it does also in the case of Dissenters and Roman Catholics to a certain extent. So that the right of interference in Church matters, founded on this, is without sufficient grounds. The State did not take the property of the Church from Roman Catholics, and give it to the Church of England ;—to say so, infers a gross ignorance of historical facts. The Church was reformed, and retained her property. But even supposing, for the sake of argument, that the case was as is asserted, and that the Church *had* been endowed by the State,—still this does not bring the advocates of State interference to the conclusion they want to arrive at ; for, in the first place, it does not follow, that because the

State endows a particular religious community, it has therefore the right of regulating all the spiritual concerns of that community. The community itself must *consent* to this arrangement, or else the assumption of such power is unjust. It must be a matter of compact and agreement. To give a piece of land to provide for the support of the minister of a congregation, gives no necessary *right* to interfere with the doctrine or discipline of that congregation. So that the claim of right fails altogether in this point of view. And again; supposing that we were to *concede* the existence of such a right founded on endowment, still this would not justify the State in giving the exercise of that right to persons of a *different religion* from the Church. Supposing the Church had been endowed by the State, and had agreed that the State should regulate all her affairs, and had never possessed a convocation, or legislated for herself, yet still she never could have consented that persons *alien from her faith* should be her legislators.—This is the grand evil and injustice of the present state of things, which was never contemplated as possible by any party until recently.

Another crying injustice, which is perpetrated under the sanction of the existing law, is the appointment of the chief rulers of the Church by persons who are either indifferent to the spiritual welfare of the Church, or are actually hostile to her. The appointment of bishops and deans is notoriously influenced by considerations of a political description, by interest, or by other merely worldly inducements. It is placed in the hands of those who may be of no creed, or of some creed different from that of the Church of England. It is exercised by persons who are under the influence of others, who are aliens from the faith of the English Church, and seek for her destruction. The position of the Church is thus that of an army, whose generals are appointed by the enemy; or of a country, whose commanding positions are all in the hands of a hostile force. The enemies of the Church have the power, under the existing law, of appointing her bishops and deans. They may choose men especially for the purpose of bringing discredit on her, ruining her character, exciting and promoting divisions, or subverting her faith and discipline. All this is in their *power*, according to the existing law. And here a question arises, not only whether such a state of things is reconcilable with common justice and fairness, but whether it is consistent with the law of God? The Church of England is undoubtedly not responsible for the present state of things; for it has arisen wholly out of the changes in the constitution of the State. But it is a state of things in which the Church could not *acquiesce*, without serious sin. There is now no longer any sort of security

for the soundness of faith of newly-appointed bishops. They may be advanced by disbelievers in the Church's creed; they may be selected in order to subvert the Creeds and Articles and Liturgy of the Church. However suspected their faith may be, however irreligious in life, immoral in conduct, heretical in doctrine, however unfitted they may be in all respects; yet the chapters can be compelled, on pain of imprisonment and confiscation, to elect them. The archbishops may be obliged, under the same penalties, to confirm them; and the bishops selected to consecrate may be compelled, under the same penalties, to join in the act. This is not "religious liberty;" it is absolute tyranny, and a gross infringement on the rights of conscience. Chapters, archbishops, and bishops are compellable by law to commit a most fearful sin, in sending forth those whom they may believe and know to be unfitted for their office. Chapters and bishops may be convinced that a person nominated for the office of bishop *has none of the qualifications required by Scripture in a bishop*; and yet they are made liable to premunire if they hesitate to elect and ordain! They are entrusted by God with the responsibility of sending forth faithful labourers into God's vineyard, and they are forced by law to disregard the responsibilities they owe to God!

Under these circumstances, we cannot avoid expressing the opinion, that the offices of deans and other members of chapters, and the offices of bishops and archbishops, are at present full of snares for souls; and that no man can with a safe conscience accept any of those offices, except with a resolution to discharge his duty in it with a single eye to the responsibility which he owes to God, and with a determination to submit to any legal penalties that may befall him, rather than consent to the election and consecration of a bishop whom he believes or suspects to be unworthy. We believe that those who, through fear of any temporal losses or penalties, take any part in betraying the flock of Jesus Christ to wolves and anti-christs, are guilty of most deadly sin. No pretence of obedience to most unrighteous laws of man, will avail them in the last day, when they are accused of having betrayed the trust confided to them by their God.

The present state of the law in this respect is really so monstrous, that it cannot possibly stand the test of examination. It only exists, because it is left unnoticed. Bring it to the light, and it is at once convicted. The dean and chapter are convened, and proceed under the usual forms to hold an election of a bishop, invoking the Divine aid to guide their choice, and having been duly authorized by the Crown to choose a godly and faithful pastor. The whole of this proceeding is converted into a solemn mockery by the provision of the law which gives the Crown the



power of nominating the person to be elected, and compelling the chapter to elect him under penalty of prebendary. As long as the State was a thoroughly Church of England State, and the Sovereigns in all their actions showed themselves resolved to maintain and defend and advance the religion of the Church, there was a reasonable ground for believing, that none but fit and proper persons would be nominated for election by the chapters ; but now all is changed. The nomination has passed away from the Crown to the ministers. Those ministers are virtually appointed by the House of Commons, which is perfectly indifferent towards the religious interests of the Church, being composed of religionists of all kinds. The ministers reflect this indifference, and, therefore, there is no kind of security that proper bishops will be nominated ; and yet, the law continues to compel deans and chapters to go through the form of praying to God for His blessing on an election which they may have every reason to believe in their consciences to be injurious to religion ! Now, such a state of things is really intolerable. It is a disgrace to this age of liberty to continue regulations which are completely imbued with the spirit of persecution. Men are compelled by law to act against their consciences, on penalty of imprisonment and confiscation ; archbishops and bishops are liable to the same penalties, if they act on their consciences and refuse to confirm and consecrate a bishop whom they know to be unsound in faith or unholy in life.

But, it is argued, the ministers must have the absolute power of appointing whom they please to be bishops, because the bishops have seats in the House of Lords, and are thus mixed up with politics, and it is therefore requisite that the political leaders should be enabled to place partisans of their own in episcopal sees. This view is one that, without doubt, exercises great influence over politicians, but it will not exercise any influence over the minds of Churchmen. Are the interests of religion to be subordinated to those of political parties ? The argument, in fact, goes to show that the appointment of bishops should altogether cease to be made by the political ministry. Were it removed from the ministers altogether, and made unpolitical, all political parties would equally lose the prospect of putting their friends on the episcopal bench, and no one would be strengthened at the expense of any other. What is most to be desired for the welfare of religion is, that the Church should stand aloof from mere party politics as much as possible. It is the general wish of the country, that bishops should not be politicians : they lower their influence and position by being so, and they seldom add much weight to any party, because they are always divided in

politics. However, we have not the slightest expectation of convincing politicians and the heads of political parties that they would do well to relinquish this patronage: all we mean to say is, that the convenience of politicians does not in any degree diminish the *injustice* of giving to parties alien to the Church and hostile to her, the power of directly or indirectly nominating her bishops and leading dignitaries.

And now to pass on to another of the grievances arising out of the present state of the law. What can be more monstrous than that state of things under which the decision of cases directly affecting the doctrine of the Church of England, is placed in the hands of a court without any distinctive creed? Persons holding belief opposed to that of the English Church—Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Infidels—may, under the present state of the law, be supreme judges in Her Majesty's Privy Council, of all causes affecting the faith of members of the English Church. A clergyman accused of denying the divinity of our Lord, may have his cause tried in this court by a Unitarian. Another, who shall dispute the inspiration of Scripture, and the fact of a Divine Revelation, may be tried by a judge who equally disbelieves in revelation. Now this is, we maintain, a perfect mockery of justice, if the court is supposed to be constituted for the purpose of upholding the doctrine of the Church of England. To permit persons who disbelieve her doctrines and are hostile to them, to determine whether this or that tenet is in accordance with those doctrines, is to give them the power of injuring her to the greatest extent, either by sanctioning tenets virtually contrary to her belief, or by obtruding on her, clergy who do not believe her doctrines, and who are labouring to subvert them. It is an extreme injustice to place any Church in such a position as this; nor would it be tolerated for a moment, in the case of any other communion except that of the Church of England. It is no answer to this to say, that the Church of England has admitted the supremacy of the State, and therefore must take whatever the State pleases to ordain; because the Church never *did*, in fact, admit the supremacy of a State without a creed, or including all sects of religionists. The State which the Church of England recognized as having more or less authority in ecclesiastical matters, was a strictly Church of England state, which was opposed to every other system, and tolerated no dissent. Give us such a state again, and we would let things remain as they were; but to substitute Dissenters and Romanists for sincere members of the Church of England, and to give them the same authority over the Church, makes just all the difference between justice and injustice, between friendship and enmity, between toleration and persecution.

Another great injustice arising out of the present state of the law is, the impossibility of developing the system and discipline of the Church of England, without opposition and interference on the part of her enemies. The Church has, for a series of years, been earnestly desirous of an increase in the number of bishops, in order to promote her own spiritual efficiency. This is a point on which all Churchmen are agreed. The whole episcopate have expressed themselves favourable to it. So strong was the feeling, that the Government made its proposal to the bishops to add four to their number, and introduced a bill accordingly. The infidel and sectarian party in the House of Commons bitterly opposed this bill, and succeeded in preventing this development of the Church. The ministers have relinquished a measure which they do not deny to be a good measure in itself, because it is unpalatable to the enemies of the Church in Parliament. Here, then, is an instance of the unjust way in which the Church is treated under the present system. Her expansion in the mode which she herself desires, and which is admitted to be right and reasonable, is entrusted to a legislature which includes a large number of persons of hostile creeds, or of no creed at all. Her opponents are given the power of stopping any measures for her benefit. This is an extreme injustice and hardship to the Church of England, which no other communion in the empire experiences. The law does not prevent *them* from establishing new congregations, churches, synods, bishops, and ecclesiastical organizations. Why, then, should it interfere with the Church of England, and prevent it from exercising its own discretion as to what is advisable for the advancement of its spiritual welfare? It is a very great injustice, and a positive act of intolerance, to restrain a religious communion from making such regulations on points of this kind as it deems necessary for the welfare of religion; and more especially, when persons of a different faith are entrusted with this power of restraint. Of course, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics, and unbelievers, must be *expected* to oppose themselves to any measure which they conscientiously believe would be for the benefit of the Church of England. They would do very wrong, with *their* views, if they did not, to the utmost of their power, prevent any such measure from being passed; but then, on the other hand, it is a great hardship to the Church to be subject to their interference; and the State which has done them justice in relieving them from penal laws, is equally bound to do justice to the Church of England, by relieving her from their interference, which has been the result of the acts which gave religious liberty to them. In point of fact, the same legislation which gave religious liberty to Romanists and Dissenters, deprived the Church of her religious liberty, in placing



her under the dominion of persons of a different creed from her own. Previously to that time, the State had been substantially a Church of England State: it then wholly ceased to be so. The moment that Dissenters and Romanists were granted freedom from all political disabilities, the Church became directly subject to them, while they are perfectly protected from any interference on her part. This is an extreme injustice, which ought to be removed. If the Legislature chose to relinquish its Church of England character, it ought, in common justice and fairness, at the same time to have ceased to be the Church's legislature on matters of doctrine, discipline, and revenues. As it is, the alteration of the law has placed the Church under disabilities which she never previously suffered from. Her wishes are now liable to be thwarted in Parliament, not merely on grounds of State policy, but by sectarian animosity. She has to do with a legislature, a portion of which is hostile to her on religious grounds, and therefore a positive wrong and injury has been done to her. We do not in the least complain that Dissenters and Romanists are exempted from our interference as Churchmen in their religious concerns; but it is a gross injustice that we should not be equally exempted from their interference in our affairs. We cannot have bishops without their consent; we cannot effect reforms of any kind in our system without their intermeddling; if our Ecclesiastical Courts require alteration—if our chapters are to be made more efficient—if regulations are to be made for the trial of offences against faith or morality—if any thing at all is to be reformed or improved in our ecclesiastical or spiritual system, infidels, Dissenters, and Romanists, aid in determining every question, and of course do their best to determine it against the Church, or in the mode most injurious to her.

Now we think it is sufficiently evident, from all that has been said, that Churchmen are greatly aggrieved by the present law—that they are not treated with the same justice, fairness, and toleration which is extended to every other denomination. Their religious system stands in a most precarious and dangerous position, in consequence of the powers over the Church possessed by the ministers of the Crown, and by the two Houses of the Legislature. And then the question comes, How can this evil be remedied? It is plain that it cannot be remedied by returning back to the old system, and removing Romanists and Dissenters from the Houses of Parliament. This is altogether out of the question: nor have Churchmen any right to call for the infliction of disabilities on others, if they can release themselves in some other way.

The only remaining course, therefore, for Churchmen to take is, to demand that they shall be placed on an equality with Dis-

senters, and other denominations ; that they shall have the same immunity from the interference of all except their own members, which is enjoyed by all other denominations. We think that this demand is grounded in simple justice. Why should the Church alone be subject to the interference of persons who are not of her own communion? Churchmen are just as competent as Dissenters to manage their own affairs. They can be trusted with equal propriety by the State to arrange the concerns of their own religious system. They do not require the guidance or direction of the State more than Dissenters or Roman Catholics do. They are not to be treated as children, and held in leading-strings, while others are let go free. What possible reason or excuse can be given for so degrading a distinction? Are not Churchmen as well educated as Dissenters or Roman Catholics? Are they so much more quarrelsome than persons of other denominations, that they cannot be entrusted with the same liberties that every one else has gained? Have they alone no consciences? And are they to be expected to submit to the dictation and interference of persons of a different denomination from themselves, when no one else in the country is expected to submit to such an interference?

Politicians object to give the Church freedom, because they object to establish an *imperium in imperio*. But they have no scruple of this kind in dealing with Roman Catholics and Dissenters. They recognize the freedom of these communions in the fullest way. The Dissenters are an *imperium in imperio*, and so are the Roman Catholics, and so, therefore, may be the Church of England. If the one be right in principle, the other is equally right in principle; and if the power of self-legislation is recognized in the case of the Dissenters and Romanists, it is the grossest injustice to refuse it to the Church of England.

"Well but," it is replied, "you must not interfere with the royal supremacy. Every one admits the royal supremacy in religious matters. If you make the Church free, you destroy the royal supremacy." Now to this we reply by asking the meaning of those who argue thus. Do they mean that the royal supremacy is something necessarily inherent in the Crown, and extending to all the subjects of the Crown? Do they mean that the Queen, in virtue of her royal power, is supreme in religious causes over the nation? Because if they do, they mean that Dissenters and Roman Catholics are subject to the royal supremacy just as much as Churchmen are. If *this* be their meaning, they cannot pretend that to claim for the Church the same liberty which is possessed by Roman Catholics and Dissenters is to deny the royal supremacy. Of course, if the Crown is supreme over *them*, notwithstanding their freedom, the Church

might be equally free, consistently with the supremacy. If, however, it is asserted that the Crown has not, in virtue of its royal power, any supremacy over Roman Catholics and Dissenters, it must be equally without inherent supremacy over the Church. The essential rights of the Crown must affect all classes of subjects equally. If any such right does not exist in relation to Dissenters, it exists in relation to no other class.

It is absurd to pretend that the dignity of the Crown would be diminished if the Church were possessed of the same liberty as is enjoyed by other denominations. It would be nothing more than carrying out the principle which has been already extended by the Legislature to every communion in England, except to the Church. If the dignity of the Crown is impaired by acknowledging the freedom of religious denominations,—that has been done already,—the Crown has lost its dignity, for half the people of the empire are in the possession of religious liberty. It would be a poor excuse to avoid doing an act of justice, to pretend that the Crown would lose its dignity by acknowledging the rights of conscience, when it has done so for all other religious denominations.

Another objection against allowing freedom to the Church of England is, that it would lead to quarrelling and disputes amongst her members. The persons who make this objection seem to think, that the members of the English Church require to be chained up, like bull-dogs, for fear they should tear each other in pieces. Is this the case? Surely it would be a libel on the character of Churchmen to affirm it. It is very true that there are parties in the Church; and from what cause have they arisen? They have arisen entirely from the suppression of the Church's liberties by the State. Had not the Church been gagged and tied, so as to prevent her from exercising her own free choice, there never would have been any parties of any magnitude within our communion. The Church would have interfered with authority at an early stage, and settled the matters in dispute. As it is, the State has arbitrarily interfered, and taken these matters out of the Church's hands. It has determined, for the last 130 years, that *no controversies shall be settled*. Of course the result is, that they go on smouldering at one time, and blazing at another, and party-feelings are engendered. The Evangelicals have constituted a Church within the Church. The blame rests wholly on the State. We are certainly divided; but the only possible way to heal divisions is to give the Church freedom. When it is free to act, different parties will make some terms with each other; there will be a way open to make some arrangement which shall not offend the consciences of any one; or if it be found that differences are irreconcilable, there will no longer



be an attempt to keep compressed in the same communion elements which are mutually repulsive; and peace will be the result. It is the clumsy and ill-contrived attempts of states to enforce external communion without making any provision for settling disputes on essential points, or silencing those in non-essentials, which invariably leads to the greatest disturbance in the Church. The State knows its own incompetence to deal with theological subjects: it will not trust the Church to settle its own affairs; and so its only remedy is, to tell Churchmen that their communion must be made wide enough to accept, without dispute, any doctrine or tenet that may find its way into it. The State "recipe" for healing Church controversies is to force Churchmen to recognize as brethren and members of the Church those who, in their opinion, deny the essential doctrines of Christianity. Such a policy is sure to fail eventually, and it always largely increases the amount of irritation and the intensity of controversy. We believe that the differences between parties in the Church are perfectly capable of reconciliation to a great extent, if there was any way or means of reconciliation. But what can be done, when the State *will not permit any adjustment of differences to be made*,—when its only hope is, that those differences will die away? The effects of this policy is to aggravate differences to the extremest degree. If the State does not like existing divisions in the Church, it has no one but itself to blame for them.

We must say a few words more on the supremacy of the Crown, in order to place our argument in a clearer light. The Church of England, then, acknowledges, and we with her acknowledge, in the fullest and most ample terms, the supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters. With the Thirty-seventh Article, we assert the Queen to have the chief government of *all estates* of this realm, whether they be *ecclesiastical or civil*, in all causes. We maintain, with the same Article, that godly princes are authorized by God's word to rule *all estates and degrees* committed to their charge by God, whether they be *ecclesiastical or temporal*, and to restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers. According to the tenor of the old oath of supremacy prescribed by Stat. 1 Elizabeth, c. 1, we hold that "the Queen's Highness is the only supreme governor of *this realm*, and of all other Her Highness's dominions and countries, *as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal*." With the Thirty-sixth Canon we declare, that "the King's Majesty, under God, is the only supreme governor of *this realm*, and of *all other His Highness's dominions and countries*, as well in *all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal*."

All this we cordially and earnestly acknowledge and assert.

But will our opponents assert as much? Will they go to the length which the Church of England goes in asserting the royal supremacy over all "persons," all "estates," all "things," and all "causes ecclesiastical and spiritual" within "this realm, and all other Her Majesty's dominions?" Will they assert that the Crown is, or ought to be, supreme in the "things and causes ecclesiastical and spiritual," of the Roman Catholics, for instance, or of the Wesleyan Methodists, or of the Independents, or the Baptists? All these "causes and things" are within "this realm:" the ecclesiastical "estates and degrees" of the Roman Catholics, Methodists, Baptists, Independents, Presbyterians, and Socinians, are "within this realm." Has the Crown *de jure* the supremacy over all these people? We maintain that it *has*. The Church of England declares that it has; and the law of the land, as embodied in the Act of Supremacy passed under Elizabeth, declares that it has. We assert the supremacy of the Crown over this *realm*: not over a part of the realm, but over the whole; not over a section of the population, but over the whole population. Will any of the advocates of the royal supremacy in Parliament or elsewhere, will the Ministers of State, will the Evangelicals, will the Liberals, will the Rationalists, and, above all, will the Romanists and the Dissenters, go as far as we do in asserting the royal supremacy? They will not. The Evangelicals, perhaps, may go to this extent; but the rest will in most cases deny that the royal supremacy ought to extend to all classes of men, and to all causes and things in this realm. We therefore claim to be the firmest upholders of the principle of the royal supremacy. We uphold it strictly, according to the declarations of the State itself, and of the Church in harmony therewith.

However, supposing that the various parties opposed to the Church of England do go as far as we do, and assert that the royal supremacy extends over all the people of this realm in ecclesiastical matters, we have nothing further to add, than to express our entire assent to the principle, and to explain that the utmost we seek is, that the royal supremacy shall be applied *equally* to all classes of the community, as the Church declares it ought to be. We are perfectly willing to admit that the supremacy ought to be exercised over the Church of England, just as it is over all the rest of the realm. We have not the slightest objection to the supremacy of a Christian sovereign over the English Church; but we think it is only fair to expect, that when the sovereigns have consented to transfer the exercise of their supremacy to persons who may be either themselves alien from the religion of the English Church, or under the influence of sectarians, the supremacy should be exercised towards the Church just as it is towards all other denominations,—that is, the Church should

be, practically, free. If we admit the principle of the Articles and the Thirty-sixth Canon, and the Act of Supremacy, that the Queen's Majesty is supreme over all persons, things, and causes within this realm, and her other dominions, one point is very distinctly established,—that the appointment of bishops, and the summoning of synods, and the confirmation of their canons are *no part of the royal supremacy*. This may sound startling, and yet it is demonstrably true. For, observe the actual state of the case: bishops are appointed by the Roman Catholics in England, Ireland, and Scotland, and in Canada, Malta, and all the English colonies—"other Her Majesty's dominions"—without any claim, on the part of the Crown, to interfere in their appointment. The State—the law—*recognize* these persons, so appointed, *as bishops*. The law acknowledges their episcopal rank and jurisdiction over a portion of the people of the realm. Therefore, assuming that the law considers the Queen to be supreme over all her subjects, it is plain that the appointment to bishoprics is not a part of her supremacy. The law also recognizes the episcopal character of the bishops of Scotland,—it admits them to be bishops—and yet the Crown does not appoint them.

And now to consider the case of synods. The Roman Catholics in Ireland have lately held a national synod without asking the license of the Crown to meet, or seeking any confirmation from the Crown for their canons or regulations. The Wesleyan Methodists and Dissenters hold synods without being obliged to ask the Crown's leave or sanction. If, then, we hold that the royal supremacy extends to the whole realm and to all causes, and things, and degrees, it is evident that we cannot admit the summoning and confirming of synods to be amongst the essentials of the royal supremacy, because the law sanctions the people of this realm in holding synods without reference to the Crown.

We are aware that such inferences may not be palatable to some persons, but they have only one alternative—either they must hold with the Church of England and the act of supremacy, that the Crown has supremacy in ecclesiastical things or causes over the whole realm, in which case they must admit that the appointment of bishops and the summoning of synods are no part of the supremacy; or else they must hold in contradiction to the Church of England, and of the whole theory of the constitution, and the whole body of the old statutes, that the Queen is *not* supreme in ecclesiastical things or causes over the whole realm, but only over a part of it—or over some portion of the people. If they maintain this latter principle, they undermine the supremacy, for they separate it from the royal power, in pronouncing that it is not universal. They make it a privilege, an advantage, a possession of the Crown—just as the Crown lands are a portion of the rights



of the Crown, and yet are not inalienable. If the supremacy relates merely to the Church of England, it is a prerogative of the Crown, but it is not an inalienable prerogative: it is not an essential of the Crown's rights, which cannot be parted with. If others are exempted from the supremacy, the question occurs at once, why should not the Church of England be also? It becomes then at once a question of expediency; Whether it be or be not advisable to extend the same rule which applies to Dissenters to the Church of England also? On this view it is quite impossible to defend the continuance of the supremacy over the English Church alone, as a matter of *principle*. Those who take this ground, must be contented to argue on grounds of expediency only.

We sincerely hope that these questions will be fully and freely discussed. In the present day all that is wanted is full inquiry. The Church of England will largely profit by the fullest investigation. We have seen a species of declaration put forth by some distinguished members of the Church of England on the subject of the royal supremacy, and the sense in which they understand it. We do not wish to express any opinion on this document further than this, that we trust it will lead to further inquiry, and to full discussion. We are at present living amidst a curious jumble of the institutions and principles of the sixteenth and the nineteenth century, which are diametrically opposed to each other. Inquiry and attention will dissipate the absurdities by which we are surrounded, and make "civil and religious liberty" as it should be—not merely the privilege of the Dissenters, but of *all* the people of England.

We have entitled this paper "Church Emancipation." We may as well explain what we mean by this term. We do not mean by it the liberation of the Church from the royal supremacy, or from the influence of Parliament. We mean by "Church Emancipation" nothing more or less than the liberty of Churchmen to settle the affairs of their own Church, without any interference, direct or indirect, by persons of any other religion, or of no religion at all. This is the point we contend for. It may and will involve the repeal of laws and the modification of the relations of the English Church with the imperial power; but this is not the principle for which we contend. That principle is, that Churchmen shall, like all other Englishmen, be exempt from the interference in their religious concerns of persons who are not of their own communion. If this principle can be carried out without materially altering the laws, or depriving the Crown of any privilege it exercises, so much the better; if not, we still claim what is nothing but plain and common justice. Churchmen alone are not to be left without freedom in religious matters, and

obliged to submit to the interference of persons alien from their creed. They are not to be made the only exception to the general rule. Their claim for emancipation from the rule of persons not of their own creed, is one that only requires to be heard, in order to convince every fair-minded man of its justice and its moderation. That claim may be opposed for a time by clamour and misrepresentation; but if it is steadily persisted in, it must, in the end, be heard and conceded.

We therefore think that it is the duty of Churchmen to go forward firmly and unflinchingly in their course, seeking on all occasions the restitution of their religious liberties; and with a full confidence that they will eventually be attained. They must not be discouraged, or turned away from their purpose, by the attacks or the devices of their opponents. We have long foreseen the probability that the Evangelical party will not continue in its state of quiescence. They were kept quiet, evidently by Government and by the archbishops, for some time after the decision on the Gorham case. This was in accordance with the policy of the Government and the Privy Council party, who declared that the judgment had given general satisfaction, and who were extremely anxious that no movements should take place, but that the judgment should be allowed to pass at once as an undisputed law. When the opponents of the judgment began to make themselves heard, there was still evidently an *enjoined* silence maintained by the other party: it was curious to observe how anxiously their journals avoided notice of the subject, lest they should increase the excitement. *Then*, the feeling of the country began to show itself so very decidedly *against* the judgment, that there was equal discretion manifested in avoiding an attempt to elicit approbation of the judgment, which would probably have proved a failure. So that the Privy Council party had the great discomfort of seeing the whole display of public feeling against them. They had to sit by, and hear the most open confession of the truth by large masses of clergy and laity in every part of the country; to be condemned by bishops, and to witness great public meetings of laity and clergy against their views. All this was, of course, most trying to the tempers of the more violent partisans, who were thus curbed by orders from their superiors, on the wisdom of which they have probably had many a misgiving.

The Government having now succeeded in defeating any attempt which might have led to the immediate reversal of the decision of the Privy Council, are probably indifferent as to what course matters take; and hence there will, doubtless, be no opposition on their part, and that of the archbishops, to an organization of the Evangelical party for the purpose of counter-

acting the movements of the Church party. We shall probably see, ere long, the Evangelicals, who have hitherto been declaring on all occasions in the course of this controversy, that their whole wish is, that different parties and principles may live in affectionate fraternity in the same Church, as they have "always" done,—we shall see them now, most probably, adopting some course of directly aggressive policy, with a view of driving out of the Church those brethren to whom they are so much attached. It will probably be seen, ere long, that their notions of *toleration* are meant only to apply to persons of their own opinions. Their object will, probably, be to strike up a firm alliance with the State, in the expectation that the whole patronage of the Church will fall into their hands; and to endeavour to thwart the objects of Churchmen by directing against them a series of attacks, with the object of withdrawing their attention from the objects before them to their own defence. They will endeavour to carry the war into the enemy's territories, to compel him to act on the defensive. We have little doubt that this will be the course of policy pursued; Churchmen should be on their guard against being diverted by it from their objects. They must pursue their objects and defend themselves at the same time. We recommend great caution in dealing with the movements of any organization of Evangelicals; it will be conducted with much craft; and the Union movement must not be ready to take the course to which it may be provoked by its opponents.

Without doubt the great weapon employed in future against the Emancipationists will be, as it *has* been, misrepresentation of their objects and principles. There is but one way of meeting this. The objects and principles of the friends of Church liberty must be made as clear as the day *by themselves*, so that misrepresentation may only recoil on its authors. There must be no lurking suspicion left; but Churchmen must come forward so manfully and so openly with an account of their purposes, that it will be IMPOSSIBLE to slander them. When this is done, the whole strength of the opposition to them will be at an end. They will go on without any material let or impediment. But, let them pursue any policy of concealment, let them refrain from making their principles and objects unequivocally manifest, let there be any opportunity for the enemy to calumniate them, and represent them as *Romanists*,—and they will certainly fail.

On this account, as well as for other reasons of equal urgency, we would strongly recommend, that the greatest possible care and discrimination should be exercised in future in the choice of persons who are to hold any official or leading position in the Church movement. No man should be selected to fill such offices unless



he possess the *first grand requisite of a firm faith in the English Church*, as she stands distinguished from Romanism and from other systems of religion. Without this essential qualification, no amount of rank, virtue, ability, or learning, should recommend any man to a prominent and leading position. If he does not stand forth and give clear and satisfactory evidence of the staunchness of his principles—if he refuses to give satisfaction to inquiries, but permits some mystery to hang over his sentiments on the fundamental point of adhesion *ex animo* to the creed and communion of the English Church in preference to the Roman, and to all others, he should be at once set aside as ineligible. It will not any longer do in these times to have doubtful, wavering, undecided men as leaders, who may shortly fall away from the Church, and who will always be sure to favour a weak, timid, tortuous, and unpopular course of policy. None but firm and open adherents of the English Church should be trusted to lead the cause of that Church. No cold and doubtful men will be a gain to that cause. We must have a bold, open, undisguised course of policy. We must plainly say what we want, and be prepared to prove that it is necessary for the security of the Church of England; and if we act thus, no power can avail to crush our claims. If Evangelicals, and Rationalists, and Erastians, and Infidels misrepresent us, and oppose us, their misrepresentations will be only injurious to themselves if we are thoroughly honest, and thoroughly open and bold. If we merely seek for liberty—for the national rights of freedom which the constitution extends to all but ourselves; and if we merely seek what we sincerely conceive and believe to be essential to the security of our own religion; it will be impossible to raise any permanent feeling against us. If our opponents succeed in creating an opposition for a time, the people will fall away from them when they have ascertained the facts of the case; and we shall then succeed.

To the Church, then, our advice is, to set aside all political parties—none of whom can be trusted:—to follow no political leaders:—to let Whigs and Conservatives, Free Traders and Protectionists—men in office and men out of office—settle their disputes as best they may. Let the Church—we mean the Church element within the Church—have nothing to do with party politics of any kind—because no parties can be trusted. Instead of thus depending on statesmen, let them throw themselves on the people—the sovereign people!—Let them engage the people on their side, and their work is done.

In applying to the people, the Church would apply to the real sovereign of the country. The supreme power is vested in their hands

by the recent changes in the constitution. England is a republic with monarchical and aristocratical forms; but the people have a power before which all others in the State bend. Hitherto the Church of England has been altogether a royalist and an aristocratic Church: it is now bound to become a popular Church also. It is of much more importance to her to stand well with the people than with the other parts of the State. She is bound on principle to please the people, because they have been virtually invested with sovereignty by law. If the Church gains the support of the people, she will have the support of the Sovereign and the aristocracy.

Now on what principles must the cause of the Church be brought before the people? We can tell our learned theologians, and our subtle reasoners, that all their systems must be unlearned again, if they are to make any impression on the people. They may do well enough for educated, refined, thoughtful people; but they are simply unintelligible to the great mass of the population, *i.e.* to ninety-nine out of every hundred of our people. They cannot enter into discussions on Baptism and its effects. They cannot discriminate between "High Church" and "Low Church." Convocations and synods they know nothing about. They do not care a single farthing about the spiritual rights of the Church, or its liberties, &c. They, perhaps, know very little about any particular doctrines; and they see no danger in Evangelicalism, or any other "ism"—*except* Romanism. Now then, it is plain, that in applying to the people, "learning" and "eloquence," and so forth, will not be of the slightest use:—they will be rather a hindrance.

How, then, are the people to be influenced? There is but one way of moving them.—In the first place, they must be taught their duty to *obey* the law of the land, even if it should be an unjust law. They may then be led to see in what condition the law places them. They must be taught that they are a *degraded* and *enslaved* set of men; that they have not the religious liberties which Dissenters and Romanists possess; that Romanists and Dissenters regulate the affairs of the Church, though they will not let Churchmen interfere in their affairs; that we are suffering under a gross injustice, and are liable to continual insults from persons of different denominations. Put before the people the insulting language of Romanists and Dissenters charging the Church with being the slave of the State. Teach them to feel themselves insulted and degraded, and treated with injustice; and then "the Sovereign power" will begin to move in our favour. We think that if this course is pursued, eventual success is certain. Let the people of the Church once be brought to feel

that they are injured, and that they have grievances to complain of; and nothing can or will prevent them from obtaining a remedy. Ministers may oppose, and Evangelicals may unite with them; but the sense of *wrong* once well-rooted will, in the end, prevail over all opposition; and those who are on the side of slavery will go to the wall. In order, however, to bring forward the cause of the Church with any reasonable prospect of success, the ordinary machinery must be provided for the purpose of setting the members of the Church to work in the right direction. Amongst the publications which have appeared in various ways, bearing on this subject, we have not seen any which appears to be equal in ability of conception and healthiness of tone to that which bears the name of Mr. Denison—the leader of the Church movement on the Education question. The gratitude which is due to Mr. Denison for his untiring advocacy of the Church's cause, and which is, we are assured, most widely and deeply felt, will at once ensure an attentive hearing to him on any subject bearing on the general interests of the Church. No man has more fully established his right to be heard on such questions. Mr. Denison apologizes in his advertisement for asking public attention at the present crisis; but none of his readers will feel that such an apology was requisite from him.

We are very glad to see that Mr. Denison is of opinion that the time has come to get beyond the Gorham case. We cannot go on eternally disputing on this case. It is now an established *fact*. The results and tendencies of that fact constitute a large item in the perils affecting the Church. Still, like the Hampden case, it is virtually settled, as far as the present law is concerned, and it would be unwise to go on attempting to found further agitation on that special case: it must now take its place in the general list of grievances. We entirely concur therefore in the following remarks of Mr. Denison:—

“It is no part of the writer's purpose to review any particulars of the Gorham case—all this has been already done—thoroughly and effectually done. The many fallacies of the judgment of the Supreme Court have been dragged to light—the claim of that judgment either to ability or truthfulness has been set aside—the sin of betraying the FAITH in the matter of Mr. Gorham's institution needs no further proof. It is time now for Churchmen to take off their minds, so far as may be, from this special case, as from a *detail*, and to fix them upon the *principle*, or rather upon the *negation of principle*, which has enabled Mr. Gorham to obtain an unworthy triumph over his diocesan, over the CHURCH and the FAITH. This negation of principle, including, first, the denial of objective truth, and, secondly, the absolute ignoring of the primitive and Catholic position of the Church of England—this



negation of principle, upon which *alone* the judgment of the Supreme Court can be maintained, is the very spirit of anti-christ, tricked out in the garb of a more enlightened reason, and a more enlarged charity."

Mr. Denison remarks, with great feeling, on the painful position of Churchmen in these days, in finding themselves obliged to defend the faith of the Church against a State which had been for so many ages united to her in the closest alliance. It is our only consolation under this painful alienation, to feel that it has not been the work of the Church; that we have not to reproach ourselves for those alterations which have impressed a Latitudinarian and creedless character on the State, and have rendered it a perilous ally to us. There has been a continual protest against the various acts of legislation and policy by which the State has been so widely severed in faith from the Church. And yet it must be admitted, as Mr. Denison remarks, that the Church has not in fact resisted, as she ought to have done, the encroachments of the State on her spiritualities. She has not been alive, as she ought to have been, to the dangers thence arising. And why is this? We must ascribe it in great measure to her habitual dependence on the Government, and on the Hierarchy. That dependence, connected with the highest and best principles, and justified to some extent by the experience of former times, long prevented the Church at large from viewing her real position, and protecting herself. In depending on the State, or political parties in it, all freedom and energy was lost. Men were taught still to look solely to a temporal power, which was gradually ceasing to possess any religious principle. And the Episcopate has always been, for the most part, under the influence of the State to so great an extent, that it has never dared to move for the liberties of the Church. It has been divided in opinion, and has been unable to act together. Of course, the Church, in depending on the Episcopate to be led, has virtually relinquished all action on such questions. We are not quite prepared to agree with all that Mr. Denison says, in reference to the silence of so many of the bishops on the recent theological question. We have no doubt that several prelates, who have not spoken so openly as might have been wished, have not been restrained by any doubt on the question itself. Yet the expression of opinion ought to have been stronger and more unanimous on such an occasion; and it is lamentable to observe some prelates preaching "peace" in such a matter, or declaring that the faith is not in any way endangered.—But such things must be, while the Episcopate is nominated by the heads of political parties.

But there are other internal dangers besides these; and to one of them Mr. Denison draws attention in these words:—

“There are other Churchmen again; men in one sense sound in the faith themselves, *i. e.* who profess the faith, but profess it as matter of their own subjective belief, not as matter of the objective belief of THE CHURCH CATHOLIC; who are very dangerous to THE CHURCH; men who hold contradictory positions; men who hold the Scriptural doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and yet approve of the judgment of the judicial committee; men who tell us to cease from contention about the doctrine of sacramental grace, and to unite with them in stemming the flood of infidelity, which is *about* to assail—they might say, which *has already* assailed—even the inspiration of the Scriptures. Do these not see, then, that the only ground upon which the battle of the judgment can be fought, is the very ground upon which are planted the outposts of the infidel? Do they not see that the *denial* of *all* truth is aptly preceded by the *indifference* to any *specific form of it*; and that the judgment of the judicial committee has but re-echoed the memorable question asked on the day of our redemption in the judgment-hall of doomed Jerusalem; “What is truth?” Or do they really think it possible that those who are content that the judgment should be such as it is, can ever be united for any good purpose with those whose daily prayer it is that they may have grace even to lay down their lives, so that one step might thereby be made towards blotting it out for ever from the records of the Church of England, and effectually preventing the recurrence of so perilous an experiment for the time to come?”

After some further remarks on the possible rupture of the alliance between Church and State, in consequence of the proceedings of the latter power, Mr. Denison thus states the alternatives now before the Church:—

“1. Submission to the claim of the State to create bishops, without regard being had to the judgment of the spirituality as to their fitness for ‘the office and work of a Bishop in THE CHURCH OF GOD.’ Submission to the claim of the State to insist upon the institution of priests to benefices with cure of souls, without regard being had to the judgment of the spirituality as to their fitness, at the time of institution, for ‘the office and work of a priest in THE CHURCH OF GOD.’ Submission to the claim of the State to insist upon any profanation of the offices of THE CHURCH, which may result from the application of those offices indiscriminately to all persons, whether in communion with THE CHURCH or not. Submission to the claim of the State to exercise that interference with the matter and the manner of the education of the people, which it is utterly impossible the State can exercise in any degree, consistently with the due discharge of the responsible office of the ministry of THE CHURCH.

“This is the first of the three things presented to the choice of the Church of England. It is the *existing* state of things,—a state of things in which the civil power does in effect claim, however it may disavow such a claim, to be supreme judge both of doctrine and disci-

pline; to exercise a virtual control over the whole matter and manner of the education of the people. The claim is, indeed, protested against here and there, and some demands are made for redress, and *so far as this is done*, individual Churchmen are free from the guilt of acquiescence.

"But there is no *redress*, nor any *prospect of redress*, that I know of.

"2. The second thing is to allow the existing submission to become *absolute*, *i. e.* to cease from protesting and demanding redress. In short, to submit, not, as now, in the hope of the dawn of better times, but because it has become the general opinion that, after all, it is as well to submit. In other words, to continue to be THE ESTABLISHMENT, but to cease absolutely to be THE CHURCH: because the sacred trust committed by the great HEAD OF THE CHURCH into the hands of the spirituality, will have been abandoned and betrayed.

"3. The third thing is to combine, as under a sense of the most imminent danger, and as warned of GOD, for the defence and assertion of the rights and liberties of THE CHURCH, and of her claim to be allowed duly to discharge those special functions, the due discharge of which is the very essence and principle of her original constitution by OUR BLESSED LORD.

"I believe I have fairly stated the case,—neither overstated it, nor understated it."

Those who are advising us to "be quiet," and to let "peace" return to the Church, are of course acting on their own view of what is best for the Church; and it is quite right that they should be listened to with respect and good feeling. But they take so different a view of the state of things from others, that they cannot expect to have any influence with them. Those who wish us to be "at peace," and to let the State in general, and the Privy Council in particular, regulate our religious and educational affairs as they please, will not be able to enter into the principles and views which influence men like Mr. Denison. His view is this, and we believe it to be the only sensible view:

"Whatever may have been the case hitherto, THE CHURCH *cannot* any longer rest satisfied with protests and demands for redress from individuals or private bodies of her members: she *cannot*, because if she does, *she will die*; that she *will not*, the last few years have served to indicate. The time is come now when the indication must be converted into a certainty, and THE CHURCH must set her own seal upon a great system of agitation, because it is plainly written upon the wall, that *if she do not she must shortly die*."

Some good men think, that by refraining from "agitation," and permitting the events to take their course, the Church will act most for her own security. All they want is "peace," and they persuade themselves that if "agitation" could be suppressed,



there would be an end of dangers. They cannot endure the barking and growling of the guardian of the fold. They would silence him, and trust to the mercy of the wolves who are prowling outside. They would disband the military retainers who walk about the towers of Zion, and leave themselves defenceless. They imagine that their deeds of benevolence and of charity—their obedience to the “powers that be”—their inoffensiveness and blamelessness, would save them from enemies to whom the very existence of those virtues and good works is the sorest of reproofs and the cause of the bitterest enmity and hatred. They trust in a State which has shown in all its acts that it is open to no considerations whatever but those of earthly policy, and temporary expediency—to a State which has given power to the hereditary enemies of the Church to legislate for her, and in all ways to interfere with her. With every possible respect for the good intentions of those who recommend a course of submission to this state of things, we must express our conviction that their policy is simply suicidal; and that the only safe policy is a bold, a resolute, and an open one. In the words of Mr. Denison :—

“*Churchmen must combine throughout the length and breadth of the land.* There has been such a thing *without* the pale of THE CHURCH, as ‘a solemn league and covenant.’ I am not afraid to say that there must be an analogous combination now *within* the pale of THE CHURCH. The great object of THE CHURCH’s league and covenant must be the immediate restoration of her synodal action. So soon as this is attained and placed upon sure ground, let all irregular action and combination at once cease and determine. Till it is attained and placed upon sure ground, *let the whole land be filled with both*; let it be a reproach to a parish that it does not agitate; that it does not contribute something, at least, of its means and its energies, towards the effective support and encouragement of those whose immediate business it will be to superintend and to conduct; pressing THE CHURCH’s claim in every way which is open to men in free England, upon the public mind, upon Parliament, and upon the Crown. Does any one suppose that such entire freedom to agitate and combine in THE CHURCH’s cause will be denied by the civil power; that the liberty, conceded to the Corn Law League of our days, and to the schism of an hundred years, will be denied to THE CHURCH? I have no belief that any statesman, however liberal, will be found to attempt so direct an infringement of popular rights: the attempt itself would not simply be ridiculous; it would not simply be an egregious failure; it would tend very powerfully to encourage the entire movement and combination, which it was its object to defeat.

“It will be obvious at once that I am contemplating a very different thing indeed from the existing action and extent of Church unions.

The resistance offered, through their organization, to the encroachments of the civil power, has been hitherto desultory, and growing out of daily circumstances. It must henceforth be systematic and concentrated, and directed, as its *final* object, to the one great end of the restoration of the synodal action of THE CHURCH, as the legitimate remedy for all her difficulties. To say that Church Unions have not been without their use,—to say this, and no more than this,—would be thankless and unjust. But no one surely can suppose that their present extent and mode of action can suffice to meet the dangers and the requirements of THE CHURCH. Without them, indeed, THE CHURCH would have been powerless, and naked of all means of combined defence against the many aggressions of the civil power during the last five years. But as these aggressions multiply, and become more aggravated and more afflicting, more full of warning and of peril to the very life of THE CHURCH, so must the means of defence be multiplied, and extended, and developed also, and brought to such state of completeness, as any irregular action of THE CHURCH will permit.

“We have at present some twenty Church Unions; they should be reckoned by hundreds.”

This is the right spirit. Churchmen must put from them all timidity, and be ready to advance their cause boldly, in the face of the world, “before rulers and kings.” They must put on the energies of primitive Christianity, fearing the face of no man on earth, and girded up for the contest in firm faith in the rectitude and justice of their cause. They must put from them the retiring, modest, and unassuming virtues, which have hitherto distinguished them, and come forth as soldiers of the Cross, prepared to do and to suffer in the cause of Christian faith. Such must be their spirit and their resolution, in case circumstances should call on them to make sacrifices for Christ. They will be met by opposition, contempt, ridicule, and persecution; they must be prepared to bear it all, and even to glory in their tribulations.

For the details of the organization proposed by Mr. Denison we must refer to his pamphlet. It includes the design of a general meeting of members of Church Unions—a certain number from each—to be held periodically. This, and the other details of the plan, appear to be perfectly practicable; and we hope the suggestion will be in some way acted on without delay.

On the financial branch of the subject, one of the highest practical importance, Mr. Denison offers the following remarks, which contain much matter for serious thought, as involving principles of deep importance, and which we never remember to have seen stated before.

“Is it too much to ask that, when the life of THE CHURCH is at

stake, we should, each of us, carefully review our position and our means, and all the arrangements of our life, set apart the utmost we can give for Church Union purposes, *and make a great point of punctual payment?*

"But the exigencies and the nature of the case demand that we should go much further even than this. And I have two suggestions to offer,—the second of which is, I know, very little likely to be received favourably; but I offer it, nevertheless, because I know of nothing which represents so powerfully my own sense of the extent and the magnitude of the evil that has come upon us.

"First, then, I would suggest, that collections be made every year in our Churches, in aid of a fund, to be applied, at the discretion of the central consulting body, for promoting the restoration of the synodal action of THE CHURCH. There can be no just exception taken against making collections in our Churches for such a purpose. The restoration of the synodal action of THE CHURCH is, undoubtedly, a great and legitimate Church object,—I should say, especially under present circumstances, the greatest and the most legitimate.

"The second suggestion I have to offer—and which I entreat Churchmen to believe, that nothing but a deep conviction of our imminent peril would have persuaded me to offer at all—is this—that, if it be found impossible to give money for *all* Church purposes, that purpose, *which is the first and most pressing of them all*, and the present frustration of which is at the bottom of much of our present distress—I mean the restoration of the synodal action of THE CHURCH—should hold the *first* place, and that, if need be, all other purposes—whether these be *even* the support of the Church Societies—or such purposes again as the restoration and decoration of churches—or any other of those many ways in which Churchmen are denying themselves for THE CHURCH's sake—should give place to it, and that the money bestowed upon such purposes now should be given—until we get our synodal action fully and freely restored—in aid of this same fund. Now, as respects the Church Societies, a feeling of indignation, by no means an unnatural one, will doubtless arise in many minds, that any one should be found to make a proposal like this. Others again, who may have no strong feeling upon the matter, may say that it is like proposing to cut off the limbs to enable the body to move more freely. My reply to the first is, that it is not because I do not wish the Church Societies to flourish, but because I wish them to flourish *healthily* under the shelter of THE CHURCH herself, that I have made my suggestion; and my reply to the second is of the same kind,—that the body is diseased, and the limbs more or less infected thereby, and that before the limbs can do their office well, and before the discharge of that office can be a true sign of the body's vigorous life, that life and vigour must be found within the body itself. Till we get our synodal action, I doubt whether the working of the Church Societies can be really healthy; and what, after all, is the real "*bonâ fide*" use of Church Societies, if we cannot save THE CHURCH herself? Convocation, or Synod, is the one great



object before us—the one great point of safety : no support of Church Societies will bring us nearer to Convocation ; once get Convocation, and Church Societies will be placed on a far more satisfactory footing than they are now. If, however, Churchmen shrink from withdrawing their contributions, of whatever kind, from the Church Societies, for the above purpose, they will, I think, hardly refuse to place the Church Emancipation Fund side by side with the funds of the societies, and to make the same exertions for the one as for the other.”

Without doubt there is much in this that is in a great degree novel to us. We have been so much accustomed to look to certain machinery for ordinary Church institutions, as the great object which demands our sacrifices and our exertions, that the notion of putting the demands of the Church Emancipation cause on a level with them, or even above them, appears to us, at first sight, somewhat startling ; yet we think that the more the point is examined, the sounder will appear the principles of the above passage. If the very essence of the Church is endangered by the present system, nothing can be of so much importance as to correct that system and obtain security for the Church. In times of war the institutions of peace languish : in times of extraordinary peril, resources must be gained, if necessary, by severe sacrifices. Every thing may be dispensed with, save the great duty of standing by the faith of the Church.

This sacred cause is not to be worthily defended by any men who are themselves of ambiguous faith. He who leads the host of the Lord must not shrink from declaring himself solemnly to be on the Lord's side, lest in the midst of the contest he should be found a recreant and a deserter. These are times in which men must “speak out,” in more senses than one. They must not permit their intentions to remain doubtful in reference to the great point of adhesion to the faith and communion of the Church of England. They must make their choice between the Church of England and Rome, and not shrink from declaring whose they are. If, from any cause whatever, they shrink from this, they are not fitted to be leaders of the Church's cause. We cannot afford to have leaders who cannot be depended on. For the following noble declaration of his adhesion to the Church, we are deeply grateful to Mr. Denison. We have always felt that nothing less than the firm faith which the following declaration breathes throughout, could have carried its author through his exertions in the Education cause :—

“In coming forward, as I have now done, with an appeal to Churchmen to combine for the defence of THE CHURCH, and for the recovery of her rights and liberties, and to make exertions, not in degree only,

but in kind also, such as have not been made hitherto, I feel that it would be inexcusable if I were to leave any room for a doubt as to what I mean when I use the words 'the defence of THE CHURCH,' and that I may be allowed, under the peculiar and pressing evils of these times, to make here a PROFESSION OF FAITH.

"I mean, then, the defence of the doctrine and the discipline of the Church of England, as distinguished, on the one hand, from the corruptions of Rome, and her additions to the Faith; and, on the other, from the miserable results of the abuse of private judgment, and from the licence of those religious bodies who have, from whatever cause, departed from Apostolical order, and have devised 'Churches' without 'the Succession.' I mean the defence of the doctrine and the discipline of the Church of England as restored, after the model of primitive Christianity, in the sixteenth century.

"I am not concerned to defend the manner in which this was done, or all the agents in it, or all the parts of the act itself. But, if I rightly understand the true position of an English Churchman, it is this: that, looking back upon the events of the sixteenth century, and setting on one side the evils of severance of communion in which those events involved the Church of England, and, over and above these, the manifold evils of the abuse of private judgment; and, on the other side, the good which the same events produced in clearing away corruptions of the Faith, and in restoring amongst us primitive Christianity, he acknowledges, thankfully, and in strict accordance with true Church principles, that the good very far overbalances and outweighs the evils, great as these undoubtedly are, and blesses God that his lot has been cast in the Church of England. I have never been able to understand, I cannot understand now, in this, the darkest, hour of the Church of England, what it is that has power to prevail with our brethren to desert her Communion."

We must now bring our remarks to a close. We rejoice to believe and to know that such principles as Mr. Denison here so manfully avows, are deep-rooted in the hearts of the Clergy and Laity of England; and in this, under God, is our hope that the Church will gain what she requires. To that deep-rooted faith—to that firm and unswerving devotion to the English Church, we look with confidence—nay, with certainty—for the maintenance of those principles in which we have been nurtured. Come what may, the true sons of the Church will stand firmly arrayed beneath their banner; and though many should fall away—though they should be assailed on all sides—though even their Spiritual Rulers should depart from the faith, or yield to the pressure of an unbelieving State—the CHURCH OF ENGLAND can never fail, while even a few are found faithful to their principles and to each other.

- ART. VI.—1. *The Testimony. To the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and others in places of Chief Rule in the Church of Christ throughout the Earth, and to the Emperors, Kings, Sovereign Princes, and Chief Governors over the Nations of the Baptized.* 4to Edition. Printed by C. Morgan, Henry-street, Pentonville. 8vo Edition. Printed by Moyes & Barclay, Castle-street, Leicester-square.
2. *Narrative of Events affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole Christian Church.* Printed for Private Circulation, by George Barclay, Castle-street, Leicester-square. 1847.
3. *Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, to all the Kings of the World, to the President of the United States of America, to the Governors of the several States, and to the Rulers and People of all Nations.* Liverpool: Woodruff. 1845.
4. *Letters exhibiting the most Prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.* By ORSON SPENCER, A.B., President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in Europe. In reply to the Rev. William Crowell, A. M., Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A. Liverpool: Orson Spencer. 1848.
5. *Divine Authority; or, the Question, Was Joseph Smith sent of God? No. I. The Kingdom of God. Nos. II. and III.* By ORSON PRATT, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Liverpool. 1848.
6. *A Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil.* No date.
7. *Absurdities of Immaterialism; or, a Reply to T. W. P. Taylder's Pamphlet, entitled, "The Materialism of the Mormons, or Latter Day Saints, Examined and Exposed."* By ORSON PRATT, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. Liverpool. 1849.
8. *Friendly Warnings on the Subject of Mormonism. Addressed to his Parishioners by a Country Clergyman.* London: Rivingtons. 1850.

MULTIFORM as error is in its very nature, as the Protean counterfeit of unchanging truth, there are certain types and categories



of error which re-appear from time to time, under different circumstances and under different aspects, yet with a certain kind of family likeness by which their kindred origin may be discerned. We drew attention to this fact when, some time ago, we gave an account of the Irvingite delusion<sup>1</sup>. We then pointed out the resemblance between the rise of the Irvingite sect in our own times, and that of the Montanists in the early Church, and of the French Prophets at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Since then our researches into the history of religious aberrations have brought us acquainted with another modern delusion, which, by a singular coincidence, started in the Transatlantic world, contemporaneously with Irvingism in this country. The coincidence in the time of the origin, as well as in the manner of announcement of, the two sects, respectively, is so striking, that we cannot forbear placing side by side their own records of the fact. The register of the birth of Mormonism, the American counterpart of Irvingism, we have already placed before our readers<sup>2</sup> in the words of the Mormon prophet, Joseph Smith, himself, and we here transcribe it :—

“On the 6th of April, 1830, the ‘Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints,’ was first organized in the town of Manchester, Ontario County, State of New York. Some few were called and ordained by the Spirit of revelation and prophecy, and began to preach as the Spirit gave them utterance, and though weak, yet they were strengthened by the power of God; and many were brought to repentance, were immersed in the water, and were filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of hands. They saw visions and prophesied, devils were cast out, and the sick healed by the laying on of hands. From that time the work rolled forth with astonishing rapidity.” . . .

The autobiographic notice of Irvingism is contained in the “*Narrative of Events*,” (No. 2, at the head of this article,) and is to the following effect :—

“In 1830, certain members of the Church of Scotland, who had been instructed to look for and expect a revival in the Church of Christ, and to hope and desire the restoration of the gifts of the Holy Ghost for the refreshment of the weary and disheartened children of God, were visited with spiritual power, and yielding to the movement of the Spirit within them, gave utterance to the voice of the Comforter, who thus ‘with stammering lips and another tongue,’ according to the words of the prophet (Isaiah xxviii. 2), put to shame the spiritual pride and intellectual drunkenness of the age, and in tongues and prophesying offered rest and refreshing to the simple and childlike, to those weaned from

<sup>1</sup> English Review, vol. ix. pp. 13—50.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. vol. xiii. p. 403.

the milk and drawn from the breast. Some persons in London, members of the Church of England, who were partakers of the like faith, received also the like answer from God; the Holy Ghost vouchsafing to them also to speak with tongues and prophesying."—*Narrative of Events*, pp. 6, 7.

Before we proceed further, it may be well to state, that since our article on Irvingism was written, a fortunate chance has thrown in our way two of the secret documents of the sect,—the "*Testimony*,"<sup>3</sup> and the "*Narrative of Events*." This circumstance, coupled with the fact that we were compelled by want of space to break off our account of the Mormonite sect without giving an outline of its doctrines, has determined us to devote another paper to the development of those twin-delusions; thus performing a half-promise which we gave to our readers at the close of our last article on the Mormonites, and at the same time putting them in possession of some curious documentary matter, to which it is, under ordinary circumstances, impossible for the uninitiated to obtain access. We could have wished to have extended our store of materials in the last-named direction; more particularly we were desirous to get hold of two Irvingite books, which play a conspicuous part in the proceedings of the sect, viz. a manual of esoteric liturgical offices, used mainly, we believe, in the visitation of the sick; and the book of "*Records*," i. e. the written record of the prophetic "utterances" given forth from time to time. Neither of these is, as far as we have been able to learn, suffered to fall into the hands of the Irvingite "laity," being strictly confined to the angels, priests, and other office-bearers of the sect, who—with a discretion second only to that of the Romish priesthood in hiding away the Bible from their flocks—read portions of the "*Records*" in the course of the public services, taking care, withal, not to read any thing to the people which might have the effect of "stumbling them," as it is appropriately termed. In this respect, it must be confessed, the Mormonites have the advantage of their European brethren. Not only is the "*Book of Mormon*" published to the world, but that which answers to the "*Records*" of the Irvingites, the "*Book of Doctrines and Covenants*," is circulated freely within the sect itself, and sold to the public at large. Why should not the Irvingites follow this example? The mystery in which the principal documents of their faith are enveloped, has but an ill look,

<sup>3</sup> Of the "*Testimony*" there are, as we have indicated, two editions. The large one, in 4to, appears to be the earlier one; the small one, in 8vo, being accompanied by notes, in which various points, especially those connected with the "four-fold ministry," and the organization of the sect generally, are more fully expounded. The date of the document itself is 1837.

and says as little for the genuineness of the pretended revelations as it does for the confidence of the sectarians in the character of their contents. There can be no good reason why such documents should be kept secret, especially in a Christian country; the inference is, that their authors themselves feel that they are unable to endure the ordeal of criticism. If they would avoid the suspicion that the foundations of their faith will not bear the light of day, let the Irvingites openly declare "those things which are most surely believed among them." We hereby challenge them to do so; to cast off the veil of darkness in which they have enveloped themselves, and to "come to the light." Meanwhile we will do for them, as far as it lies in our power, what they seem unwilling to do for themselves.

The characteristic feature of both Irvingism and Mormonism is the pretension to a new revelation, rendered necessary by the alleged insufficiency of the Gospel as revealed by Christ and his Apostles. In their view of the matter, there has not been, for many ages past, any true Church of Christ upon earth. The existing Churches of Christendom, confounded in one common condemnation with all the sects, are denounced as being altogether carnal, destitute of the spiritual endowments, and lacking the spiritual offices, which are essential to the very being of a Church. In the midst of this spiritual desolation the two sects, respectively, profess to have been raised up as the nucleus of the restored Church, at the close of the Christian dispensation, on the eve of the second Advent. It is upon this view of Christendom that the "*Testimony*" is founded. After a description of the Church as she should be,—bearing the "characteristics of oneness, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity,"—it thus portrays the "failure of the baptized :"—

"We pause from the contemplation of this mighty mystery revealed unto the holy Apostles and prophets by the Spirit, and manifested in the Church, to this intent, that unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the Church the manifold wisdom of God; and we look abroad to behold, in the baptized, the antitype of this vision of beauty, and blessedness, and glory,—a glory which depends not on the gorgeousness of earthly splendour, but which consists in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. We look for an united body, the saints of God, manifesting his holiness—the purity and truth which becomes his children. We look for that ministration of the Spirit, more glorious than that of the law, through the various channels ordained in the beginning, in the completeness whereof God is revealed; for by the gifts which He hath given, He dwells in his Church. We look for an united people, as a body, bearing witness to God in the eyes of all men, that He is their Father, and they his children—and to



whom He giveth witness before all men by the mighty works of the Holy Ghost. We look for these things; but where can we discover them? The goodly order framed by God for an end not yet accomplished, hath been maimed of its noblest parts, and disfigured in its fairest proportions; instead of going on unto perfection, the body of the baptized hath retrograded; they have cast aside or carelessly let slip the means which God had vouchsafed for their perfecting. Had they used the means aright, the end should have been attained. 'Their line should have gone through all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world.' That witness should have been the means of gathering the good seed into the garner, and the chaff unto the unquenchable fire; but the very first office in the Church, Apostleship, in men Apostles,—that fan in the hand of the Lord whereby He purges his floor,—that ordinance whereby He baptizes with the Holy Ghost and with fire, hath departed (whatever partial apostolic ministry may have survived), although the end of the gift of Apostles remains yet unattained; the voice of the Lord in prophecy, through men, given to that end, having been despised or dreaded, hath long ceased to be uttered, and the people of God have been left to the silence of death; the Spirit being quenched, hath refrained to manifest Himself as in the days of old; the Comforter hath ceased to remind concerning Jesus, those who in heart imagined that they had need of nothing; and the powers of the world to come, the healing of the sick, the casting out of devils, and every other demonstration that Jesus is Lord, and that the kingdom is at hand, have all but disappeared, for men have sought to make this world their rest, and no longer desired the kingdom of heaven. Oh, for the awakening of the baptized from the long lethargy in which they have been buried! for a ceasing from the petty controversies and divisions, the heart-burnings and oppositions, the Eastern Church against the Western, the Roman Catholics against the Protestants, wherewith Satan hath distracted their attention, that they may look around and survey the fearful ruins of many generations! What section of the baptized beareth in its outward lineaments or in its inward spirit the character of the one holy Catholic Apostolic Church? Who can look at the glories of the beginning and measure themselves thereby, without shrinking from the comparison? But, though man may deceive himself, God is not mocked. In vain He searcheth the face of Christendom for the *marks* of the Christian Church. The churches, called by divers names, furnish them not. Unity, the foundation of all the rest, is utterly destroyed. Without this, the others cannot be possessed. The holiness described in Scripture, is that of a body united and visible, complete in all its parts, each part in its own measure manifesting holiness, and all in the measure of every part growing up in holiness. Again; without unity and holiness, catholicity cannot exist;—an united Church, an holy people, can alone preach the Gospel to every creature, or teach all nations to observe all things which the Lord hath commanded, can cause all men to believe and know that God sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world. And, lastly, the one holy Catholic Church, can alone be

apostolic, for it is in such a body alone that God hath set 'first Apostles,' and such alone can send forth Apostles, or other ministers by Apostles ordained, to bear that witness and communicate that life, for which the Church was constituted. The Christian body as it is, can send forth only the missionaries of a sect, or of many sects, to the nations of the heathen. It cannot furnish Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, to minister from the body the one Faith, and the one Spirit. Tried by the line of judgment and the plummet of righteousness, it cannot be justified. As truly as the angels left their first estate, as certainly as the nations before the flood apostatized and quenched the light given unto them from God through Adam, as surely as the Jews who crucified the Lord rejected the counsel of God against themselves, so truly the baptized have fallen from the glorious standing wherein God placed the Church at the beginning."—*Testimony*, § 52.

This "failure," or "falling away" of the baptized, began, according to the "Testimony," in the days of the Apostles themselves, so that from the apostolic age downwards, the true Church has become extinct:—

"While St. Paul continued to labour among the Churches, he was compelled to complain that they had fallen from their first love into coldness, and from their grace and liberty into bondage. The Corinthian Church, filled with spiritual gifts, the earnest of the kingdom, and the preparation of the coming of the Lord (so that, as he saith, 'ye come behind in no gift, waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ') is at the same time described in his epistles to them, as polluted with scandalous sins; idolatry of men, and partisanship, envying and strife, disorder and rebellion. And very speedily, after but a few years of active ministry, he was delivered up bound unto the Romans; and then we find him complaining of those even at Rome, 'who preached Christ of contention, supposing to add affliction to his bonds.' And as the last scene of martyrdom approached, and the hour of his departure was at hand, in the midst of prophecies and forebodings concerning the evil days which were coming on the Church, we find that 'all they in Asia had turned away;' Demas had forsaken him; 'Alexander did him much mischief,' at his first answer 'no man stood with him, but all men forsook him.' While the memory of the Apostles has been loaded by posterity with honours all but divine, they were yet in their lifetime many times despised and set at nought, both by Churches and by individuals; and God suffered the will of man to prevail, and withdrew, but only for a time, the authority which was resisted, and the holy rule and discipline which the unholy could not endure.

"Thus does Scripture indicate the existence of sins naturally leading to the withdrawal of the apostolic function as exercised in men set apart for that purpose; but the fact that the gift of Apostleship hath been suspended in its actual manifestation in men, Apostles, God's ordinance for its manifestation, while God's gifts are without repentance, and the purpose remains unaccomplished for which that gift was given, is of itself

the overwhelming evidence of apostasy. The suggestion of modes wherein God hath or might have provided for the continuance of unity of doctrine or administration in the Church, is beside the purpose: these substituted means can never fulfil the work to which the original instrument ordained in the wisdom of God was adapted. . . . .

"We have shown that God's ordinance for unity of spirit, of faith, and of rule, is the Apostle; that the law of the universal Church can flow only from those who, under Christ, have a permanent jurisdiction and episcopate over the whole Church throughout the world; and that to Apostles alone hath that authority been committed,—nor by any other, patriarchs, bishops, or presbyters, whose power of action is practically confined to their own province, diocese, or parochial district, can universal control be exercised, or catholic reformation be introduced. And, therefore, the duty of all bishops, from the beginning unto this day, yea and of all who long for the peace and welfare of Jerusalem, should have been to cry unto God, day and night, in the first instance to preserve, subsequently to restore, the ministry of Apostles to the Church.

"It is true that, when and as in consequence of that unbelief and indifference which hindered the cry from ascending to God for the continuation of his gifts, the Apostles ceased from the Church, the bishops, by a necessary devolution and preference, succeeded to the chief place of authority; but it is equally true that *in that act, and by that necessity*, God's way of unity in his Church was violated: and the whole experience of the Church since that period down to the present times, when a new and more monstrous form of wickedness has come in, has been but a perpetual struggle for an unity to be brought about by *unlawful means*—by appeals to the strong arm of power (the first instance whereof was to a pagan emperor, Aurelian, and so early as the middle of the third century), or by the usurpation of one bishop over his brethren. Such was the sin, and such has been the punishment of the baptized as a body: the sin—that they were content, and their rulers interestedly content, in the cessation of the Apostleship: the punishment—the cruel tearings and rendings of the body of Christ; the schisms, and distractions, and divergencies in faith and discipline; the tyranny of the power of the State, or the usurpation of an universal bishop. And yet it is never to be questioned, that God, the merciful and gracious one, has always from age to age used and honoured in his Church the best He could find in it, and so his saints and true children have never been altogether destitute, nor hath He ever failed to be faithful to whatever of his name and ordinances still survived under the load of human inventions." — *Testimony*, § 53—55.

The reservation made in the concluding paragraph, which allows the continuance of the Church, and of the work of salvation in some sense, and in a limited degree, is further worked out, and the failure of the Church described as consisting in the cessa-



tion of the apostolic and prophetic offices, and in the lowering of the measure of grace given unto men :—

“This is not a question of Church government alone; we have already shown the connexion between the ministers of the Church and the ordinances for spiritual life. It is true these have been still administered, not indeed by men ordained by Apostles, and on whom the word of prophecy had gone before, but by men ordained by those who had succeeded to Apostles, in whom did rest, and by whom was dispensed, a blessing of grace indeed, but a blessing curtailed in a measure proportioned to the curtailment of the office, and to the contraction of the Church in its principal members, and consequently in the whole economy of its existence. We may not deny that a measure of the Holy Ghost has been given by the laying on of bishop’s hands, or that grace has been bestowed in the sacraments, administered by those whom they ordain; for that would be contrary to the verity of the continued existence of the Church as the body of Christ, and would imply that the Church had failed altogether; but it would be equally contrary to God’s truth and the verity of the Church, to assert that a bishop is God’s ordinance for bestowing the Holy Ghost, according to his own perfect way, revealed in his word, or that it is a matter of indifference whether the medium be a bishop or an apostle. For as we have said in respect of the pastoral, so we say of this function. An apostle is given of God, to rule over the universal Church, to confer the Holy Ghost by imposition of hands, and to minister the Spirit in all his fulness to bishops and all others. A bishop is a *bishop*, and not an apostle; with his own ministry to fulfil, however, and with a limited grace to confer, in the confines of a limited jurisdiction.

“It is true, that, although apostles and prophets had ceased, the Church was still, and hath ever been, complete in her head in the heavens. He was still the Apostle and Prophet to his people, and the Church was still *the body*, capable of receiving the ministrations of those offices in men, and of containing those manifested members (although not as it ought ever to have been, visibly complete in those memberships on the earth). And, therefore, it hath ever been possible that, as his wisdom might determine, those ministries should again be put forth in men, apostles and prophets. He could provide, and He hath provided, that his Church should never fail. But there hath been no change of plan, no secondary instrumentality for effecting his purpose, the first having failed, and been set aside as useless. The first, indeed, hath hitherto failed through the sin of his people, and He hath used what instruments He could, until He might again bring forth his first ordained means among a people who should have faith to receive them. But they have not been withdrawn, nor has their office been supplied without miserable loss. The full instrumentality by which the Holy Ghost ministereth grace to the baptized is not in operation, and, therefore, the full grace is not ministered; the gifts, by means whereof the Lord God might dwell among men, have not been retained; and the abiding

presence of God hath been exchanged for a condition wherein the glory of the God of Israel hath seemed to be obscured—hath, as it were, removed from off the holy resting-place, and hath been fain to linger on the threshold. The ordinances expressly provided of God for conveying life unto the Church, and the principal ordinances for circulating it from member to member, have been stayed; and the stream of life hath flowed scantily, and circulated feebly; the growth of the Church hath been hindered, all things have retrograded, and God's purpose in the Church hath rested in abeyance.

“The sacraments, therefore, being now administered by men who received their commission through inferior means, and unto a people who, as a body, could not be receiving the full ministry of the Holy Ghost—seeing that the ordained channel for that end was lacking,—have ceased to be the living realities they were intended to be,—the faith which in its wane could not retain the principal ministries of the Church, was insufficient to apprehend the full blessing in the sacraments. The disputes and controversies concerning sacraments are the standing evidence of apostasy and unholiness. If the baptized had continued in the enjoyment of the inward grace, there could have been no room for disputation as to the outward means. If the life of Jesus were manifested in their mortal bodies, and the mighty powers of the world to come exercised; if the Church were revealed as the true abode of the Lord Jesus Christ—by the Holy Ghost, and his real presence demonstrated by the changing of the faithful into his image from glory to glory—there could be no dispute whether initiatory ordinances were merely outward marks of Christian profession and an admission into outward privileges, or whether they impressed a spiritual and indelible character on the souls of the recipients, whether grace be conferred in sacraments, or merely faith be assured. But when faith ceases to realize, and to educe in the life and conduct, that the baptized are dead with Christ, and, through faith, freed from sin,—‘dead unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord,’—they cease to bear witness to God that He is faithful to his ordinances, and their unholiness is the practical denial that baptism is any thing else than a mere passport for admission to the outward privileges of the Church. And when the glorious mystery of the true sacramental presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Holy Communion, and of the true partaking of his most holy flesh and blood, has lost its spiritual and genuine demonstration in a people *consciously and manifestly* dwelling in the Lord, and He in them, through the Holy Ghost, they, conscious of their loss, have sought, by means which must infallibly lead to deeper evils,—by pageantry presented to the eye, or by ingenious arguments addressed to the understanding,—to set forth a truth which can only be apprehended in the Spirit.”—*Testimony*, § 62—64.

The same view is taken of the subject in the “*Narrative of Events*,” where it is set forth as the result of an immediate revelation :—

“At the time of the setting up of the Church in London, the APOSTLE was made to direct that the 2nd and 3rd chapters of the first book of Samuel should be read; and during the reading of these chapters words of prophecy were spoken, applying them to the present state of the priesthood throughout Christendom. Eli, grown old and blind, showed the present want of discernment and discipline in the Church, the true priestly dignity and authority nearly gone. The two sons of Eli, fulfilling the priestly office, showed the division between the episcopal and presbyterian forms of Church government; the conduct of the young men described the abuse of the priestly authority; the Churches defiled, treated, not as the holy Bride of Christ, but as harlots; the priests using the offerings of the Lord to their own advantage, and not for the glory of God. Samuel’s call was applied to the work of God calling and appointing, in an extraordinary way, those who recognized his voice, and were willing to serve Him, to be priests in his house, instead of taking and using the established priesthood, who, as a body, had refused to recognize Him, and had departed from his way. ‘For in those days the word of the Lord was precious, and there was no open vision.’ Samuel, not knowing God’s voice, but going to Eli, and learning from him that God had called him, was applied to the state in which those were among whom his voice was heard, who only recognized his purpose to use them by slow degrees, and after many private intimations; and only discerned that the call was of God from its accordance with what is found written in the ancient fathers and primitive documents of the Church. Other words were added as to the rejection of the present degenerate priesthood, and the bringing in of the true priesthood ‘after the order of Melchizedec’—the priesthood in the power of an endless life. And the judgment upon the present priesthood was declared to be pronounced, though the full carrying of it out should only be seen when Solomon, the king of peace, should reign.”—*Narrative of Events*, pp. 24, 25.

And in another place we have the following lamentation over the present condition of Christendom:—

“Alas! alas! for the blindness of eyes and hardness of heart of this generation. Speak to the most orthodox among them of the ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors, as the means of the perfecting of the Church, they do not understand what is meant; speak of the need of prophecy, they are their own prophets; speak of the unity of the Church, they say they have it, or they deny they want it; speak of the first ‘principles of the doctrine of Christ,’ they are contending, might and main, for *their own views* on these subjects; but there is no unity—no standard—no certainty regarding them. They are contending, and contending in vain; for false doctrines and wicked principles gain the upper hand daily. They are contending, and contending in vain; for without the four ministries in men, commissioned of the Lord, the Church must ever be blown about by every wind of doc-



trine. They are contending, and contending in vain; for they contend against Goliath, with the unproved armour of Saul; they meet and try to combat the attacks of the Philistines, the arguments of infidelity, by an appeal to human reason. There is no smith in all the land of Israel; the men of war go down to the Philistines to sharpen their weapons there; the sword and the spear are wanting in the day of battle. (1 Sam. xiii. 19—22.) The glory of the Lord is departed; the ark of God is taken. The Lord wept over Jerusalem of old, and Jerusalem now knoweth not the time of her visitation.”—*Narrative of Events*, p. 50.

From these Irvingite denunciations of the existing state of Christendom, we now turn to the Mormonite view of the same subject: it is in substance the same, with this difference, however, that the condemnation of Christendom is more sweeping, and expressed in coarser and more offensive language. Orson Pratt, one of “the twelve Apostles,” in his “*Kingdom of God*,” says:—

“Among the vast number of national governments now upon the earth, where is there one that even professes to be the kingdom of God, or that its officers were called of God as was Aaron? Human authority and human calling are the only powers which any nation professes to have. But there are certain petty governments, called churches, organized within these national governments, which claim Divine authority, and consider their officers authorized to act in the name of the Lord. But the great question is, Have any of them been called as Aaron was? By *new revelation* Aaron was called. By *new revelation* the duties of his calling were made known. Have any of the Roman Catholic or Protestant officers been called by *new revelation*? Has God said one word to any of them? Do they not, with very few exceptions, declare that ‘there is no later revelation than the *New Testament*?’ If the revelations contained in the New Testament are the last ones given, then the persons to whom they were given, were the last ones called of God. When *new revelation* ceases to be given, officers cease to be called of God. When the calling of officers ceases, the kingdom of God ceases to be perpetuated upon the earth. Nothing is more certain, than that the church of God ceased to exist on the earth when new revelation ceased to be given. All the modern Christian churches, who deny new revelation, have no more authority to preach, baptize, or administer any other ordinance of the Gospel than the idolatrous Hindoos have; indeed, all their administrations are worse than in vain—they are a solemn mockery in the sight of God. It is a grievous sin in the sight of God, for any man to presume to baptize, unless God has authorized him by new revelation to baptize in his name. Saul, the king of Israel, lost his kingdom because he assumed the authority that did not belong to him. (1 Sam. xiii. 8—15.) Another king of Israel was smote with leprosy until the day of his death, because he attempted to administer an ordinance without being called and authorized. (2 Chron. xxvi. 16—22.) So all the baptisms and sacraments administered by modern Christian churches, who have

done away new revelation, are an abomination in the sight of God. All persons who shall suffer themselves to be baptized, or partake of these ordinances through the administration of these illegal unauthorized persons, after having been duly warned of the evil thereof, will bring themselves under great condemnation before God, and unless they repent of that sin, they can in nowise be saved."—*Orson Pratt's Kingdom of God*, Part I., pp. 5, 6.

And again, in another place:—

"Since the Apostles fell asleep, the simplicity and purity of the ancient Gospel has been awfully perverted; its ordinances have been changed, especially the ordinance of baptism; while the ordinance of the laying on of the hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, has been almost universally done away. No churches, either among the Papists or Protestants, have taught all the first principles of the Gospel in their proper order. By this we know they are not the Church of God. God is not with them. Their sins are not forgiven them. The Holy Ghost is not given to them. And they cannot be saved in the fulness of the glory of the Father's kingdom—neither they nor their fathers for many generations past. All have gone astray, far astray, from the ancient Gospel. The Church of Christ never existed on the earth without inspired apostles and prophets in it, who administered all the laws and ordinances of the Gospel without any variation from the true and perfect pattern. But the apostate churches now on the earth, have neither inspired apostles, nor prophets, nor any other inspired officers among them, neither do they consider them necessary; and yet without inspiration or revelation—without immersion for remission of sins, or the ordinance for the gift of the Spirit,—they have the bold impudence to call themselves Christian Churches. But they have nothing to do with Christ, neither has Christ any thing to do with them, only to pour out upon them the plagues written. He has not spoken to any of them for many centuries, neither will He speak to them, only in his wrath, and the fierceness of his anger, when He riseth up to overthrow, to root up, and to destroy them utterly from the earth."—*Orson Pratt's Kingdom of God*, Part II., p. 8.

Similar is the language held by Orson Spencer, the "President of the Church in Europe:"—

"Now, Sir, what has become of this miraculous and almighty spirit? Has he ceased wholly from the earth? If so, then the WATER and the BLOOD are the only witnesses now left on the earth. But, perhaps, you will say, that the same spirit still remains, without exercising his miraculous gifts and powers (seeing they are not now necessary). Shall we then understand that this Almighty Spirit is still on the earth, and in the diversified and conflicting churches, and comparatively silent and inefficient, withholding from these churches (which are by supposition the BODY of Christ), his majestic displays of supernatural

power in prophecies, healings, tongues; causing the dumb ass to speak with man's voice, causing powerful armies to flee before the pursuit of one man; and yet the world is perishing for lack of knowledge, and Christianity losing ground every day? Might we not as soon think the spirit has grown old to dotage, or lost his first love, or been beguiled into other pursuits of less importance? Surely, He never wrought so lazily, or in such imbecility and indifference in any other age, when true believers or prophets were on the earth? Strange, indeed, Sir, that he should drop off so suddenly his royal robes of prophetic, miraculous grandeur and power, to become the silent and inefficient inmate of more than six hundred clashing, contentious churches, that are yearly subdividing into minute fragments, to the confusion of all common sense throughout boasting Christendom! What a falling off of the spirit's power, and of the spirit's light and unity! Will the Holy and Eternal Spirit of God endorse such a powerless distracted state of things, as being in any way connected with his presence on the earth, or in any way the result of his doings? No, Sir, by no means. For the honour of this illustrious personage, let us never ascribe to HIM such a powerless distracted organization of heterogeneous ignorance and imbecility, as modern Christianity presents in contrast with ancient Christianity. The heavens may well blush with shame at this modern picture, purporting to be the kingdom of God on the earth. If it is the kingdom of God, how shorn of its miraculous strength! How are the prophets and seers covered!! How dim that fine gold that once shone resplendent with the celestial lustre of prophetic visions!!! Then men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, and the sick were healed, and he that lied to them was paralyzed in instantaneous death, at times.

"Orators 'boast,' as it is written of them in these 'perilous times,' of the spread of Christianity. Christianity spreading! Where is the evidence of its increase of power or knowledge? Where the least signs of approximation to 'unity of faith,' and the 'full stature measure of Christ' in 'manifold wisdom and power?' Where the ornamental beauty and symmetry of the Bride that is preparing for the marriage-feast of the Lamb? How many ten thousand years must elapse before it can be said of Christianity, 'the Bride hath made herself ready!' 'clear as the sun, fair as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners.' Surely, since her prophets have lost their power 'to quench the violence of fire, and subdue kingdoms, and stop the mouths of lions,' and her servants and handmaids to see visions, &c., the beauty of the Bride has failed—her breasts have diminished—her face is wrinkled—her eyes are dim and cannot see afar off; she is no longer a chaste virgin espoused to one husband—but she has as many husbands as sects, and yet none of those with whom she is now living can be called her husband.

"Now, Sir, will the Spirit join with such a *Bride*, and say to Jesus the Great Bridegroom, 'Come!' the Bride hath made herself ready! No, Sir, the Spirit of God will say, I never knew you; depart from me,



you pusillanimous, benighted, powerless, contentious Christianity. 'Thou Aholibah and Aholibamah, thy lewdness is in all high places;' 'thou hast played the harlot with many lovers—yea, thou hast even hired lovers' (with human inventions), instead of commanding admiration by the grace of thy 'seers,' and the 'visions of thy handmaids,' and the 'healing power of thine elders.' Thou shalt be burned with fire."—*Orson Spencer's Letters*, pp. 69—72.

The blasphemous extent to which these revilings of all Christendom are carried, in appeals to the popular mind, may be collected from the following extract, the only one we shall make from the vile publication, the title of which we have quoted under No. 6, at the head of this article:—

"*Smith*—Really, Mr. Devil, your Majesty has of late become very pious; I think some of your Christian brethren have greatly misrepresented you. It is generally reported by them that you are opposed to religion. But—

"*Devil*—It is false; there is not a more religious and pious being in the world than myself, nor a being more liberal-minded. I am decidedly in favour of all creeds, systems, and forms of Christianity, of whatever name or nature, so long as they leave out that abominable doctrine which caused me so much trouble in former times, and which, after slumbering for ages, you have again revived; I mean the doctrine of direct communion with God, by new revelation. This is hateful, it is impious, it is directly opposed to all the divisions and branches of the Christian Church. I never could bear it. And for this very cause, I helped to bring to condign punishment all the prophets and apostles of old; for while they were suffered to live with this gift of revelation, they were always exposing and slandering me, and all other good pious men, in exposing our deeds and purposes, which they call wicked, but which we consider as the height of zeal and piety: and when we killed them for these crimes of dreaming, prophesying, and vision-seeing, they raised the cry of persecution, and so with you miserable and deluded Mormons.

"*Smith*—Then, your most Christian Majesty is in favour of all other religions but this one, are you?

"*Devil*—Certainly. I am fond of praying, singing, church building, bell ringing, going to meeting, preaching, and withal, I have quite a missionary zeal. I like also long faces, long prayers, long robes, and learned sermons; nothing suits me better than to see people who have been for a whole week oppressing their neighbour, grinding the face of the poor, walking in pride and folly, and serving me with all their heart; I say nothing suits me better, Mr. Smith, than to see these people go to meeting on Sunday, with a long religious face on, and to see them pay a portion of their ill-gotten gains for the support of a priest, while he and his hearers pray with doleful groans and awful faces, saying, 'Lord, we have left undone the things we ought to have

done, and done the things we ought not ;' and then, when service is ended, see them turn again to their wickedness, and pursue it greedily all the week, and the next Sabbath repeat the same things. Now, be candid, Mr. Smith ; do you not see that these, and all others, who have a form and deny the power, are my good Christian children, and that their religion is a help to my cause ?

"*Smith*—Certainly, your reasoning is clear and obvious as to these hypocrites, but you would not be pleased with people getting converted, either at camp meeting or some where else, and then putting their trust in that conversion, and in free grace to save them—would you not be opposed to this ?

"*Devil*—Why should I have any objection to that kind of religion, Mr. Smith ? I care not how much they get converted, nor how much they cry Lord, Lord, nor how much they trust to free grace to save them, so long as they do not do the works that their God has commanded them ; I am sure of them at last, for you know all men are to be judged according to their deeds. What does their good Bible say ? Does it not say, 'not every one that saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into my kingdom ; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.' No, no, Mr. Smith, I am not an enemy to religion, and especially to the modern forms of Christianity ; so long as they deny the power, they are a help to my cause. See how much discord, division, hatred, envy, strife, lying, contention, blindness, and even error and bloodshed, has been produced as the effect of these very systems. By these means I gain millions to my dominion, while at the same time we enjoy the credit of being pious Christians ; but you, Mr. Smith, you are my enemy, my open and avowed enemy ; you have even dared, in a sacrilegious manner, to tear the veil from all these fine systems, and to commence an open attack upon my kingdom, and this even when I had almost all Christendom, together with the clergy and gentlemen of the press, in my favour."—*Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil*, pp. 4, 5.

It cannot have escaped the reader, while perusing the foregoing extracts, how adroitly the enemy takes advantage of all the infirmities and defilements which, through the lapse of ages, and in consequence of her intercourse with the world, the Church of Christ has contracted ; and of the countless schisms by which large portions as well as small sections of Christendom have been rent away from the body of Christ. We notice this particularly, because, while we examine and expose the awful delusions of the two sects which in our day lay claim to an extraordinary revelation, constituting them—respectively, according to their own pretensions,—the predestinated restorers of Israel, we are desirous of turning their errors to account for the edification of the Church, by drawing attention to those points in the condition of the Church, and of Christendom generally, which have given the propagators

of these sectarian and fanatical notions occasion to blaspheme the ordinance of God.

Two points, as far as we have proceeded, are clearly obvious. In the first place, the absence of a clear separation from the world is necessarily a stumbling-block in men's way, and forms a strong ground of impeachment against the Church. By a clear separation from the world, we do not mean an actual separation between Church and State,—which, until the Lord of the Church shall Himself force it upon her in the order of His providential dealings with her, it would be unlawful to bring about, or even to contemplate as an object of desire,—but so broad and distinct a line of demarcation between the spiritual character of the Church, with all things that appertain thereunto, and the temporal position of the Church in politics which adopt, or, at least, recognize her faith, as shall leave no room for the imputation and the taunt, that the Church has renounced her allegiance to Christ, and has become the bondsman of the secular power. It requires but little reflection upon the character of recent events to perceive how imperatively necessary it is,—unless we wish to play into the hands not only of the Romanist Communion, but of the Irvingite and Mormonite sects,—that we should jealously guard the Church's spiritual independence of all worldly rule, and, at whatever cost, vindicate that independence from the latitudinarian encroachments of the State.

The next duty which devolves upon us, if we would deprive the two sects in question of one of the most plausible arguments upon which their system of fallacy and delusion is built, is a firm, deliberate, and decisive stand against the sin of schism. So long as the infidel or the fanatic can point to the endless divisions of Christendom, as proofs that nothing certain is known touching the Church and the truth of Christ, he has a powerful argument at his command. To cut away this argument from under him, there is but one method. It cannot be done by compromise of the truth; by creating, as the promoters of that abortive scheme, the Evangelical Alliance, attempted to do, an artificial unity comprehending within itself all the most incompatible diversities of opinion. It can only be done by drawing a sharp line of distinction between Catholicity and Schism; by showing where the Church ends, and where Schism begins. Concessions on this point are, at all times, positively sinful; but they become so especially when a pretext is afforded thereby to the gainsayers to deny the possibility of arriving at any certain and definite truth, or to call in question altogether the very existence of the Catholic Church. We would urge this consideration, more especially at this time, upon those who feel a difficulty and a hesitation in



affirming the schismatical character of the Church of Rome, which, by enacting uncatholic terms of communion at the Council of Trent, has committed schism against the Church Catholic, and by intruding her bishops and priests into our dioceses, has placed herself in a position of twofold schism towards the English, as well as the Scottish and Irish Churches. So long as we do not make good the ground of our own Church, as being Catholic in position as well as in doctrine, antagonistically against Rome, we are unable to silence the Irvingite or the Mormonite, when he adduces the actual separation of the branches of the Church from each other, as an evidence of the failure of the Church. The existence of divisions, heresies, and schisms, is no argument against the truth of the Church, because their rise and progress is clearly predicted in the Word of God; but the existence of separate Churches, all having an equal right to assert their character as Churches, and yet irreconcilably divided from each other, is wholly at variance with what Holy Scripture leads us to expect; and furnishes, therefore, a plausible ground for the assertion, that the Church of Christ, as she was founded by Him, no longer exists in the world. And, from this view, there is but one step to the admission of the necessity of a new dispensation for the purpose of restoring the Church, preparatory to the Advent of her Lord.

This, as we have already stated, is the position assumed both by the Irvingites and the Mormonites. They announce to the world severally, that the Lord is at hand, and that previous to his coming He has visited his people, and raised up for Himself a Church of witnesses of his truth, and of his impending Advent. By the Irvingites this position was assumed as early as the close of the year 1835:—

“Among the many words of prophecy spoken from time to time, which at first were but little understood, were words calling for ‘the testimony, the testimony against Babylon.’ . . . . The Holy Ghost, through the prophets, declared that the Churches in all Christendom had become corrupt, and that the rulers in the state had departed from God, and that the time of judgment was at hand; that those words, *Mene, Mene, Tekel, Peres*, were written upon the institutions of Christendom; and that the Lord would have a testimony borne to the rulers in Church and State; and that it belonged to the apostles to bear this testimony. While the many words spoken on this subject were being considered, it was declared that the burden of the land rested upon the apostles, and they were directed, each one, to write down the burden of his heart respecting the sin of the land, and of its rulers in Church and State, and of Christendom generally; and that all these papers should be delivered into the hands of one, the Senior Apostle<sup>4</sup>; and

<sup>4</sup> The “SENIOR APOSTLE” is none other than the honourable member for West Sur-

that he should combine them into one ; and that the document so prepared should be delivered to the heads of the Church by one of the apostles. In like manner, and about the same time, one of the apostles, who had been also named the prophet to England, was bidden to write down and deliver to the Privy Councillors his testimony as to the state of the nation, and the work which the Lord was doing. . . .

“According to the light of prophecy thus given, a testimony was prepared to the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of the Church of

rey, who every now and then relieves the dulness of the House of Commons by the fireworks of his racy eloquence, and who takes his place by the side of Colonel Sibthorp, among the Parliamentary celebrities. In the Legislature, where he is in a position of co-ordination, he cultivates the amusing line, but among “the Churches” his words are serious, and carry greater weight ; for it appears from the “*Narrative*” that he is something very like a Pope, having been, ever since Mr. Irving’s death, the life and soul, and chief stay, of the sect. The following extracts will show the nature and extent of his authority :—

“The ministers of the Churches in London, and all the angels of the churches out of London, came together on the 7th of July, 1835, being summoned by the Senior Apostle, according to the light of prophecy ; and they were bidden to abide together for a week, and at the end of that time the Lord would fulfil his promise (of choosing the new apostles). During this period the Council in London assembled daily, and opportunity was given to the several angels to bring up any matters about which they required counsel. During these seven days, not only were all matters thus brought up settled, but the general order of the Council of the Seven Churches was shown, through light of prophecy, answering to the types contained in the several parts of the tabernacle ; and the Council was set in order by the apostles, according to the light thus given. In the Council so arranged, whenever any matter concerning the order and regulations of any of the Churches is brought forward, the question so proposed is submitted to the Council, the principles bearing upon the question are laid down by some of the apostles appointed for this end ; counsel is given by the elders of the Seven Churches, who sit as counsellors, and the seven angels gather up in a digested form the substance of the counsel thus given by their elders, adding their own views upon the matter. Seven ordained prophets, who have their places in the Council, have time and opportunity afforded them to speak any word from the Lord which may be given to them to speak. The apostles then retire to deliberate upon the whole matter, and subsequently their judgment is given by the SENIOR APOSTLE ; and thus the matter is settled.”—*Narrative of Events*, p. 38.

“The apostles, as a body corporate or college, as an unity, are the lawgivers and rulers in the Church, through whom the Lord fulfils his office, as the antitype of Moses speaking from heaven (Acts vii. 35—39. Heb. xii. 25). In the Council of the Seven Churches, wherein the whole Church is represented, and in all cases where the apostles are officially present as a body, the SENIOR APOSTLE, speaking and acting for and in the name of the apostles, is the only exponent of the mind of the Lord ; while in each particular Church or division of Christendom, the apostle having charge over or visiting the same is, so far as all laws, orders, or regulations are concerned, the exponent of the mind of the Lord ; and wherever an apostle acts officially, he speaks and acts, not from himself or in his own name, but as expressing the mind of the Lord, which is only found in the Apostolic College, and to the Apostolic College he is responsible for that which he does.”—*Narrative of Events*, p. 41.

We trust that honourable members, who have hitherto taken the liberty of deriving various measures of entertainment from the speeches of Mr. Drummond, will, after this disclosure of his real character, show a becoming sense of the reverence due to him who, in the only true Church upon the face of the earth, is “the only exponent of the mind of the Lord.” The honourable gentleman is certainly cut out for his part, and, if we mistake not, his part for him.

England, which testimony was read in the Council of the Seven Churches in London, on Christmas-Day, 1835; and the testimony, and those who should bear it, were commended to the Lord at the same time. In the beginning of January, 1836, the apostle to whom the duty of delivering the testimony to the bishops had been committed, and who was bidden to take another apostle with him as companion, proceeded to deliver the testimony to the Archbishops and Bishops of England, and to the four representative bishops of Ireland; and at the same time the apostle who had prepared the document, he (*sic*) was commissioned to make ready for the Privy Council, proceeded to deliver the same in company with another apostle as a companion, he having obtained an audience of the King, to whom he gave a copy of the same document."—*Narrative of Events*, pp. 53—55.

This, however, was only a beginning; the horizon of the "apostles and prophets" shortly became more enlarged, and they embraced all Europe,—which, singularly enough, is, in their vocabulary, synonymous with all Christendom,—in their operations. The manner in which this was done, technically termed "the Division of the Tribes," is too curious not to find a place among our extracts:—

"During the meeting of the thirteenth council, in June 1836, the second called apostle, speaking in the power of the Holy Ghost, was made to declare, that the Lord would divide Christendom among the apostles, the princes of the tribes of Israel. And the whole of the continent of Europe was accordingly distributed into ten portions, to each of which an apostle was assigned; while the two senior apostles respectively were shown that England and Scotland, with Switzerland, formed their tribes; thus bringing out the twelvefold character of the spiritual Israel, answering to the twelve tribes in the Revelation, from among whom the sealed ones, the twelve thousand out of each tribe, should be gathered, who should be the first-fruits to God and the Lamb. The apostles were further shown, that while the senior apostle remained in England visiting and strengthening the Churches, the others, according to their opportunities, should go forth into the different parts of Christendom."—*Narrative of Events*, pp. 55, 56.

After this partition of Christendom, or rather of Europe, the "*Testimony*" (No. I. at the head of this article) was prepared:—

"Not only were the apostles bidden to consider Christendom as the object of their care, but they were also directed to prepare a testimony, to be delivered to the heads of Christendom, similar in character to the former testimony, though more enlarged in its scope than that which had already been delivered to the bishops of the Church of England. And they were also shown, that it was the Lord's way to deal with the heads, through the heads; and though this testimony was a testimony to an unfaithful people who had departed from his ways, and to rulers



who had misused the authority he had entrusted to them, yet that He would not pass by his own ordinances. This testimony was accordingly prepared as the other, and was addressed to all ecclesiastical and civil authorities in Christendom.”—*Narrative of Events*, pp. 58, 59.

The document so prepared was both to serve as a guide and text-book to the apostles in their proceedings, and to be delivered in writing to the various sovereigns and rulers, civil and ecclesiastical :—

“ Generally the testimony was to form the rule according to which those who were sent forth should speak. The true end and purpose of God in the testimony was not the abolition or destruction of the proper dignity and authority of kings and priests, but on the contrary, the establishing them in the legitimate use of their authority, which they hold from and for the Lord, until He come again and claim his own. Nor were the people passed by therein, but the Lord was seeking to approach them in the true way of blessing, by turning the hearts of their rulers to the Lord, that through them, when subject to Him, the blessing should descend, like the holy oil of anointing, from the head even to the skirts of the raiment. Neither do the apostles, in that document, call upon the priests to resign their priesthood, nor to the kings to lay down their crowns, but they remind all in authority of their several liabilities, and that the Lord will require his people at their hands, holy and perfect; and they invite all, with one heart and voice, to join in prayer to God, that as He has thus far helped the apostles to bring this message, so He will also, in his own time, send them forth in the fulness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ. The testimony was for healing, not for destroying. God alone, who knoweth the hearts of all men, can tell how far such witness has been received or rejected—not outwardly but inwardly. So far as outward circumstances are concerned, there has been but little wish or desire shown, on the part of the rulers, to fall in with the invitation thus given; for of this generation it can be truly said, ‘ It is a people that do err in their hearts, that they should not know my ways.’ Little as the called apostles were prepared for the work now set before them, yet trusting in the help of Him who had called them, they proceeded generally on their missions, and Russia, Sweden, North and South Germany, Greece, Italy<sup>5</sup>, Spain and Portugal, Holland, Denmark, France, and Switzer-

<sup>5</sup> Among the “ rulers ” to whom the “ Testimony ” was delivered, was the Pope; and it is curious, as an illustration of the character and the views of the sect, to see in what light he is regarded by them.

“ The apostles were further shown, that, while the testimony was addressed to all in authority, yet that it should be first delivered to those who, in their official standing, represent the threefold character of our Lord’s authority as the Melchizedec, King, and Priest, and who in their actual position show the threefold perversion of that authority. The Pope, as the representative of the Lord Jesus, the only King and Priest, the priest upon his throne—in which character he stands, officially at least, as the usurper and forestaller of the dignity and glory of the

land, were visited by the apostles, each one taking with him, as his companion, an ordained minister. And according to the word of the Lord to them, that they should return at the end of 1260 days, they met at Christmas, 1838, on which day the 1260 days from the separation of the apostles terminated.”—*Narrative of Events*, pp. 62, 63.

Of this document we shall now—since we cannot refer our readers to the original—give a short abstract. It begins, more like a book of Euclid than like a message from Heaven, with definitions. We transcribe the whole of the opening paragraphs:—

“To the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and others in places of chief rule over the Church of Christ throughout the earth, and to the emperors, kings, sovereign princes, and chief governors over the nations of the baptized.

“In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, One God. Amen. The Church of Christ is the company of all who are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without distinctions of age or country, and separated by their baptism from all other men. One body. The pillar and ground of the truth. The dwelling-place of God. The temple of the Holy Ghost. The declarer unto all men of God’s will. The teacher unto all men of God’s ways. The depository of God’s word and ordinances, wherein is offered up all the true worship which God receives from his creatures of mankind; through whom have been conveyed all those blessings, in civil and domestic life, which have distinguished Christendom; wherein are contained the only hope for man, and the only means of accomplishing that purpose for which God waits, and which all creation earnestly expects.

“As the Church is the aggregate of the baptized, so Christendom is the community of those nations which, as national bodies, profess the faith of Christ’s Church; whose heads and rulers not only recognize that all their power is derived from God, but, being consecrated over their people in God’s church, have acknowledged themselves to be occupiers of their thrones for Christ, until He come and take the kingdom; have, by receiving anointing from the hands of God’s priests, also acknowledged that their ability to rule is by the grace of his Spirit ministered unto them by his Church; and, in that same holy act, have submitted, or professed to submit themselves and their people to be instructed in God’s ways from the lips of those, from whose hands they have received their anointing. Christendom is one corporate body; separated from all other nations of the earth, in that they recognize the doctrines of Jesus Christ as the basis of their international law, and of their dealings one with another; distinguishable from all other nations in that, by their legitimate organs, they have been brought as nations into cove-

kingdom of Christ, for in his kingdom alone can the kingly and priestly offices be united in one person—was to receive the testimony first, and to him it was delivered by the apostle, second in his call to that office, in company with the apostle who had been designated for Italy.”—*Narrative of Events*, p. 59.

nant with God ; thus entitled to all the blessings, responsible for all the duties, and exposed to all the judgments attendant on, and involved in such covenant ; and yet, as nations, distinguishable one from another, each governed by their legitimate rulers, whose authority is neither diminished nor increased, but sanctified by their profession of the true faith, and by the anointing which they have received at the hands of the ministers of God.

“ It is to this Church we address ourselves through her bishops, on whom, with their clergy under them, has devolved the ministry of that priestly office which was constituted on the day of Pentecost ; and to whom, as trustees thereof, in their several places, and parochial jurisdictions and dioceses, the souls of the baptized are committed by our Lord Jesus Christ, the Great Shepherd of the sheep.

“ To this Christendom, also, the nations in covenant with God, through *their* anointed heads, their kings, and all their chief governors, whose acknowledged duty is to rule by God’s laws, and to hear his Word from his Church, we address ourselves. And we beseech your patient audience, Holy Fathers of the Church, and royal potentates and dignities, imploring you for Christ’s sake and in his name that you will not cast aside our word unheard, or, rashly and before consideration, account it our presumption ; for we claim to have received His commission, who is your Head and ours ; whom we may not dare to disobey ; who will judge us if we have proudly and presumptuously taken on ourselves to do this thing ; and will judge you, if ye reject those to whom He hath given commission to address you.”—*Testimony*, § 1—4.

This is followed by a brief recapitulation of the history of the world from Adam and Noah downwards, and a dissertation, somewhat lengthy and verbose, on the disorganized state of Christendom, through the operation of revolutionary principles in Church and State. The picture is, on the whole, strikingly correct ; but there is this curious inconsistency, that while indifference to schism and latitudinarianism is severely blamed, a censure hardly less severe is pronounced against all who maintain that they, to the exclusion of heretical and schismatic bodies, constitute the true Catholic Church and hold the true Catholic faith ; a claim which, by whomsoever preferred, is condemned as a narrow-minded forgetfulness of “ the brotherly covenant.” The whole dissertation, which constitutes Part I. of the “ *Testimony*,” thus concludes :—

“ Wherefore, with the respectful entreaty due to your sacred offices, we beseech you most reverend Fathers, who are charged with the souls of all God’s children ; you sovereign princes, whose authority from God is supreme over all your subjects, ecclesiastical or lay, and whose thrones we approach with the homage due to God’s anointed ; that ye will listen to the message which we bring to your ears, if haply ye may find that God has indeed visited his people as in the days of old. And



though we must open the secret springs and sources of the evils wherein Christendom is involved, and of the far more fearful evils which are impending, by tracing the sins of kings and priests during many generations, and the failure and apostasy of the baptized; yet shall ye find that God hath not forsaken, nor our God forgotten us. And may his grace be with you that ye may hear and understand.”—*Testimony*, § 17.

The second part of the “*Testimony*” consists of a second dissertation of similar tendency, in which the history of the Church, more especially, is passed under review; and the divisions of Christendom, the abuses and corruptions which have crept into the Church, and the evils which have resulted from the connexion between Church and State, are all painted in the darkest colours, with a view to bring out in striking relief the remedy provided, as it is alleged, by Christ, in the raising up of the Irvingite sect. That a portraiture of this description, drawn by the clever pen of Mr. Henry Drummond, should contain many striking passages, and many views to which the most orthodox Churchman cannot but yield a sorrowing assent, is no more than might be expected, however strongly we may feel ourselves constrained, however clearly justified, to repudiate the conclusion which they are intended to support, that the spiritual life of the Church has all but entirely departed from her, and that in the Irvingite sect that life is rekindled, and the Church restored in the fulness and perfection of her divine ordinances. In evidence of this revival and restoration, the “*Testimony*” adduces the re-establishment of the fourfold ministry,—of which more hereafter—while the spiritual desolation of the Church is asserted in a succession of tirades against all existing forms of Christianity, some of which we have already transcribed<sup>6</sup>. The wholesale condemnation of the Church, in common with all the uncatholic and heterodox communions which have grown up around her, is succeeded by an exhortation to repentance, addressed to all bishops, and to all temporal rulers, and by an assurance of comfort given to those who “mourn over the low estate of Christ’s Church,” that assurance being founded on the following announcement:—

“Already He hath arisen to rebuild his sanctuary, ‘the tabernacle of David which hath fallen down,’ his dwelling-place in Zion; and from whence his testimony proceeds unto all baptized men; and it comes by the hand of *twelve men, called to be apostles by the Holy Ghost*, separated from the lands which gave them birth unto the service of Christ for all lands, for Christ’s sake; whose office it shall be, through the faith and diligent prayer of God’s people, to convey unto all the baptized in every land the blessings which Jesus, the Apostle, would bestow on his Church through apostles.”—*Testimony*, § 104.

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 125—130.

The revival in question is represented as an answer to "the secret prayer, the expression of the desires which his prevenient spirit hath stirred in the hearts of the hidden ones," as well as of "the prayers which in every age of the Church, by the dispensation of his Providence, have been offered in the ministrations of the separate communities of the baptized;" in illustration of which, the petition *Domine, afflictionem populi tui &c.*, in the Paris "*Pa-roissien*," and the Collect for the Fourth Sunday in Advent, in the English Prayer Book, are quoted. The first rise of Irvingism is then described:—

"During the course of this century especially, many who had a zeal for God in various places, but chiefly in Britain, appointed to unite in prayer for the special outpouring of the Holy Ghost. In the year 1830, in the west of Scotland, these prayers of God's people, this cry of the Holy Ghost, was answered by Himself, and the form of the manifestation in these days of spiritual drunkenness and disorder was, as Isaiah prophesied in his vision of the judgments coming on the drunkards of Ephraim and Jerusalem, 'with stammering lips and another tongue.' The members of the Church of Scotland, among whom the Spirit of the Lord lifted up his long silent and forgotten voice, were a simple and unlearned people, and as much unacquainted with any practical and literal meaning of the fourteenth chapter of Corinthians as the rest of the Church; but they had been instructed, and were looking with expectant faith that the Church should be, as in the days of old, filled with spiritual gifts, to the end they might be established. Some persons in London also, members of the Church of England, and others who were partakers of the like faith, received the like seal and answer; and when none of the clergy of the Established Church of that land stretched forth a cherishing hand to protect and shield the vessels of the Lord thus used, the Lord Himself found shelter for them, in the congregation of a minister of the Church of Scotland in London, who had stood as a witness that the Lord was at hand, and who waited for the consolation of Israel, in the restoration of the manifested gifts of the Comforter: to him, among all the good deeds for which his praise should be in all the Churches, belongs this peculiar honour, that he first recognized and permitted the voice of God to be heard in the assembly of those who professed to be his servants, and the disciples of Jesus Christ.

"It was a strange and fearful work which God then wrought, when He lifted up his voice in the midst of his assembled people once more. There was joy in heaven; the angels sung and gave glory—the angels rejoiced in heaven when the voice of Jesus was heard in the midst of his people. That voice shall not be silent any more, but shall go forth to the uttermost parts of the earth.

"And what has been the fruit of that voice, which came into the midst of the Church, and which the Church rejected; which came into the midst of the watchmen, and they knew not the sound of the trumpet

and warned not the land ; which came into the midst of the people, and they scorned and heeded it not. The voice cried, ‘ all flesh is grass ;’ and it withered the flesh, its might and power, its glory and beauty. The walk of the most circumspect has been proved to be contrary ; the ways of the most upright have been shown to be very wickedness ; the wisdom of the wise, and the counsel of the prudent have been confounded ; the thoughts and intents of man’s heart have been uncovered ; and his imaginations, which are evil continually, have been laid bare ; the light hath shined in a dark place ; the living commentary of the spirit on the Scriptures has been given, and the law and the testimony have been bound into one.”—*Testimony*, § 106—108.

The constitution of the sect as a distinct body is next accounted for:—

“ From the first moment that the voice of the Holy Ghost was heard in Scotland, the cry was raised ‘ for a body.’ The meaning of this was little understood by any, and least of all by those prophets through whom it was uttered ; but now it has been clearly seen that the gift of prophecy can be usefully and safely exercised only within the borders of the Church, which is the body of Christ. But, though ill understood, the word was received in faith ; and in answer to the prayer of those who believed, and in despite of the sin and ignorance of his unworthy instruments, God has prevailed to raise up more than a hundred persons speaking in prophecy, by the Holy Ghost ; to separate, by solemn act of the Church, twelve men, with the name of apostle named upon them by the Word of Jesus, spoken in the Holy Ghost ; to bring out a pattern, a shadow of what his Universal Church should be, in Seven Churches in London ; and to set up Churches in most of the great cities in England, Scotland, and Ireland, and in some places on the continent of Europe, and in America,—Churches rebuilt on the foundation of apostles and prophets,—each under the rule of an angel or chief minister, and elders, not exceeding six in each Church, who with the angel form the sevenfold eldership, God’s ordinance for spiritual light ; other elders, as the need of the flock demands, and God bestows them, serving as helps in the eldership, equal in office, but subject in rule and in place to the elders, deacons, and under-deacons. And to the poor the Gospel has been preached by Evangelists, as the ordinance for that special work of gathering into the Church.”—*Testimony*, § 111.

From a consciousness, seemingly, that this formation of distinct and separate “ Churches ” has a remarkably sectarian aspect, the “ *Testimony* ” anticipates the objection by an express disclaimer of schism, and by a glowing picture of the revived “ Church ” in contrast with the rest of Christendom :—

“ This is not a new sect ; it is God’s work for imparting his blessing to the whole of Christendom, the baptized world. God casts none



away ; He will receive and set in their places all who in heart turn unto Him. It is God's witness ; a Church in the midst of a disobedient and gainsaying generation, walking in obedience to all who have the rule over them. Through Christendom lawlessness prevails ; here, submission to authority. Without are divisions and sects : here is a body, one in faith, its teachers speaking the same things. Without, synagogues of antichrist, presided over by heads chosen of the people : here, a body ruled by ordinances, not constituted by the people, but given of God. Abroad, the daily services of the Church falling into desuetude, or unfrequented by the laity : here, the daily worship, morning and evening, enjoined upon the faithful by the command of God spoken in the Holy Ghost in the midst of the Church. Without, an infidel world, rising up against and rejecting kings, bishops, and titles, and all the institutions in Church and State ; wives and children not honouring their husbands or their parents, and servants rising up against their masters : here, God's Church, reverencing the king and all in authority, parents, pastors, and masters, giving honour to all orders and degrees in Christ's Church, whether those continued by succession from the first apostles, or those now bestowed upon a spiritual people by that ordinance again reviving ; paying all dues to the former, but also, rich and poor, at the command of the Lord, given unto them in these last days,—a command addressed to the conscience of a faithful people, and needing no human laws to enforce,—bringing the tithes of the whole of their income to the altar which He hath again rebuilt.”—*Testimony*, § 113.

Somewhat inconsistently with this antithetical rhetoric—“ look on this picture and on that ”—a more conciliatory tone is presently assumed :—

“ Men, brethren, and fathers, hearken ! We come not as judges and dividers over you, we come not to praise or to censure, we come not to justify or to condemn ; we come not to arbitrate between those who are disputing about the division of the inheritance of the Lord ; we come not to take up or to take part in the differences which, in many cases, from small beginnings have grown wider and wider until they have caused a fatal and incurable rent in the body of Christ,—we come as ambassadors from the Lord of Hosts, and beseeching you, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you to be reconciled to God. We come to proclaim glory to God in the highest, on earth, peace, goodwill and favour to the children of men. We come to recall you back to the old ways, to bring you back from fleshly confederacies to the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace ; to bring to your remembrance that which ye have heard from the beginning ; to revive that which hath ever been the prayer, and the hope, and the strong consolation of the Church of God ; to show you the way of holiness, the way of glory ; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord ; that it is come, and the day of vengeance of our God, that it hasteth greatly.

We know you not as Roman Catholic, or Greek, or Protestant, nor by the other names which men assume to themselves or give to their brethren; these are not the names of unity, they are the signs of disunion. We know not, nor can we acknowledge, even as Jesus Christ, your Lord and ours, will not know, nor acknowledge the names of distinction by which the members of the ONE HOLY, CATHOLIC, APOSTOLIC CHURCH have been divided into many sects. We judge you not for what is past, that we may not be judged by ourselves; for he shall have judgment without mercy who sheweth no mercy, and mercy triumphs over judgment. We judge nothing before the time; but we tell you that the time of judgment is at hand; that the Judge is at the door, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart, and then shall every man have praise of God.”—*Testimony*, § 117.

The whole is wound up by an appeal, of which the following is the most material part:—

“All the faithful must be gathered into one, and by visible separation from the faithless be shown to be one. As the servants of the Lord go forth into the lands of Christendom, and raise up his standard, so doth Satan muster his host and proceed with *his* work. And if this be the true work of God, and verily it is his own most holy and pure work, what must be the inevitable consequences of rejecting or despising it? If God draw near to his anointed, vouchsafing to them the *only* means of reformation and deliverance, if He pour out his spirit and stretch forth his hands unto them, and they reject, what can hinder that their fear should come as desolation, and their destruction as a whirlwind? The preparation of the baptized to receive the Lord when He cometh, is the fulness of the Holy Ghost. If they abide in the flesh, when He calls on them, and brings near the means that they should be filled with the Spirit, what can hinder that they should be filled with the spirit of strong delusion, and delivered up to the man of sin? If the Lord be again sending forth apostles and prophets to his Church, and the baptized reject and persecute them, they thereby proclaim themselves apostate: and thus the light shall make manifest the darkness; the coming of the Lord in the Holy Ghost to his Church shall discover who they are who fear Him, and who are those who fear Him not: the spiritual word of truth shall try all those who profess, and who are bound to know the truth, whether they be spiritual indeed; and like the water of jealousy, shall judge as faithless those who receive it not with joy.

“And now ye ministers of God, the bishops and pastors of his Church, first in blessing, and foremost in responsibility—as Fathers of the Church, as pastors of the Lord, we beseech you reject not this our Testimony. We offer to faith an help and power of God, which the upright must desire, the godly and well-instructed in the word will believe, and the faithful will seek of God. The prejudices of ages, the

sins of many generations, the false steps, yea, even the endeavours to reform the evils under which the Church hath laboured, have involved you in difficulties which, if you receive our word, must press upon you with almost overwhelming power, and from which ye cannot deliver yourselves. We call upon you not to take any step in your own strength, nor to seek to free yourselves from the obligations wherein ye are involved to superiors, to equals, or to inferiors; but this God requires of you, to stand in the places where you are, acknowledging the hand of God in his present work; confessing the sins which, like a thick cloud, have hid the face of heaven, and obscured the Light of Life: to cease from all idolatry, to stand apart from every act, or word, or thought which in themselves are evil; but to wait, with your people under you, watching day and night for the salvation of Israel, more than they that watch for the morning; continuing instant in prayer, but joyful through hope, because of the approaching deliverance of yourselves and of your people, through the power of God in the Holy Ghost. Above all, praying for us, that like as now we have been used of the Lord to bring the word of these good tidings unto you, so also we may be made the instruments of his promised deliverance, and the channels of all the blessings which the Lord Jesus Christ longeth, and hath ever longed, to pour into the bosom of the Church.

“ And you, ye monarchs and rulers of Christendom, be assured that in the returning glory of the Holy Ghost ministered unto the Church of God, is your true strength, and sure and only safety in the midst of these times of perplexity; and therefore we beseech you, in the name of our God, that ye will be bold as good soldiers for his truth, and for his Church. Stand ye faithfully in the fulfilment of your duties, discountenancing the immoral and profane; purging your courts of vice and corruption; calling into your service honest and faithful, and God-fearing men. Be ministers of good to those who are good, but of evil to the froward, not bearing the sword in vain; but above all, ye are pledged to shield and to sustain the Church of Christ; and we beseech you, leave it not to be a prey to the wicked attempts of men, nor, under whatever pretence of reformation, suffer them to dismember or destroy it: but acknowledge and uphold it in its due privileges and place, and submit yourselves in spiritual things to those who are over you, as over all others of the baptized in the Lord. And now that He raiseth up his primitive ordinances for spiritual rule and authority, fear not to acknowledge *them*. And as far as your lawful power, influence, and example extend, be helpful, that God’s work may be fulfilled, and his blessing find undisturbed passage to his Church—for this is the only way of escape for you or your people. There is no refuge in any human defences from that storm which is ready to burst upon you. The only escape is in being taken from the evil to come, in ascending to the hill of God in seeking for, and hasting unto the coming of the Lord, for which this work of God is the only preparation.”—*Testimony*, § 120—122.

[*To be continued.*]



ART. VII.—*God and Man, being Outlines of Religious and Moral Truth according to Scripture and the Church. By the Rev. ROBERT MONTGOMERY, M.A., Oxon.* London: Longmans. 1850.

Is it because men bow with veiled eyes and faltering tongue before the omnipotence and omnipresence of Him who alone is Lord of lords and King of kings, who, correctly speaking, alone *is*, since in Him we live and move and have our being, since He is not only our Creator, but also our Sustainer, since He is not only the first source, but also the everflowing fountain of existence; is it because we find the utterance of such truths too much for our full hearts, and yearning souls, that we never mention His name, seldom refer to His existence, rarely appeal to His authority, and scarcely ever speak of the personal agency, or personal being of either the Father, the Son, or the Holy Ghost?

If so, we are certainly the most reverential as well as the most devout of mankind, and our pre-eminence in both respects such as must silence at once, and for ever, the reproaches of those who have hinted at our shortcomings in these points. But, alas! the proudest nationality, the warmest patriotism, the sincerest attachment to our Church, and the deepest devotion to our country, cannot venture to hazard such a charitable hope—it would indeed be hypotheticizing with a vengeance, and putting a non-natural sense on the plainest practical proofs to the contrary. Well does Mr. Montgomery represent the question in its true light, when he says:—

“A popular tendency to resolve the personal character of the revealed Jehovah into abstract terms and impersonal properties, serves to keep man from God’s real nature, while it seems to connect him with His sacred name. But, as long as God is thus believed, He is nothing more than an Almighty Sentiment, an Infinite Notion, or Stupendous Idea, enthroned far away in some region of mist and mystery, where, indeed, speculation may soar and science dream, but from whence the intellect can derive no saving truth, and the heart acquire no sustaining motive. It is not enough, then, that we simply believe that God is, but that He so reigns, as to preserve, and possess, and empower, and control, and guide, and govern all things, from the minutest atom to the immensest world. For the correction of this popular theism, the Judaic theology is wonderfully calculated. There we find the personal agency

and legislative will of the presiding God every where present, supreme, and active : the veil of visible instrumentality is withdrawn, and behind the palpable drapery of human means and material instruments, we are able to perceive the secret movements of the Divine hand, and to trace the inaudible motions of the Divine ways. Thus a cold system of philosophic causation is never allowed to usurp the place of the Triune Jehovah, as unveiling His personal glories in natural, providential, and spiritual manifestations."—pp. 215, 216.

It would seem, indeed, that we had reversed the course of error pursued by the philosophic idolaters of the Valley of the Nile. They personified divine attributes, and then resolved their impersonation into actual personalities, thus substituting the worship of many false deities for that of the One true God. We have, on the contrary, resolved the Godhead into His attributes—deprived the Eternal of His throne, the Almighty of His power, and so far proceeded in our course of virtual atheism, as to look upon creation, salvation, and sanctification, not as the personal acts of a voluntary agent, but as the mere modes of operation of an impersonal cause. Appalling as this statement is, it is strictly true ; and, what is more appalling still, there is scarcely one man amongst ten thousand whose mind and heart, whose faith and love, whose inward being and outward conduct, have not been, and are not, at the present moment, influenced, we should rather say, clouded and polluted, by the all-penetrating poison of this subtle miasma.

If we examine the matter carefully, and carry our investigation into all the schools of thought and feeling which possess any wide-spread influence, whether they be religious, political, or philosophical ; we shall find amongst the most striking characteristics of the day, a tendency to *finalize second causes, viewing those as the sources which are only the channels of power, and to actualize impressions, æsthetic, moral, or intellectual, thus substituting subjective shadows for objective realities.*

And both of these fatal misapprehensions, as to the real nature, order, and relation of things, arise from the absence on our parts, of a vivid and practical consciousness of the being and the nature of God, and from its natural result a desuetude and an actual inability to contemplate Him as He is.

The only chance for the moral regeneration of our country lies in a resuscitated consciousness of an indwelling and encircling God. The life of all that is living, the truth of all that is true, the Being of all that *is*, the only Lawgiver, the only Ruler, the only Source of all power, capacity, or capability, material or immaterial, physical or spiritual, moral or intellectual. Until we realize all this in our feelings, as well as our thoughts, in the spontaneous

ebullitions of emotion and intelligence, which arise unbidden from our hearts and minds, and indicate the actual state of our inward being, we cannot cope with any of the multifarious forms of error and heresy which assault or threaten us. When we have done so, we are in a condition not only to defend ourselves, but also to rescue others.

I. God is the source of all truth; nay, He is the Truth Himself. In Him from all eternity have dwelt the forms of everlasting reality, moral and intellectual, the reflected images of which pervade His creation. There is no moral virtue, there is no mathematical certainty, there is no human obligation, there is no rule of ratiocination, which may not be referred directly to Him, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. All is true which accords with the truth; all is false which does not.

It was a strange infatuation of Horne Tooke's to argue from a fanciful derivation, that Truth had no substantive existence. It is a pity that that ingenious sophist had not investigated with equal pains and greater success the derivation of  $\Lambda\Lambda\text{H}\Theta\text{E}\text{I}\text{A}$ , which clearly is compounded of the *alpha privativa*, and the verb  $\Lambda\text{A}\text{N}\Theta\text{A}\text{N}\Omega$ , and signifies, therefore, that which does not, or rather which cannot, lie hid,—in other words, that which is self-evident, that concerning which there is neither doubt nor obscurity.

What a noble train of thought does this open, when we refer such expressions to the Truth, considered as the name of God, who manifests Himself every where, and in every thing, to the eyes which are not blinded by ignorance or error!

But to return to our late subject.—God, and God only, is the truth. In His substance He is substantive truth; in the unity of the Trinity He is personal truth. Objective truth is but a partial vision of God, more or less modified by the medium, spiritual, moral, intellectual, or physical, through which He manifests Himself to us. Subjective truth is but the impression of God upon the soul, the last stage in the manifestation of God to man passing through the medium, or using the instrumentality of objects intellectually, morally, or æsthetically discernible.

All idea, therefore, of separating truth from God, of setting up any standard of truth except God, of looking upon subjective sensations or convictions, as of any value, save in proportion as they are faithful impressions of the Eternal *Sigillum Domini Nostri*, faithful images of the heavenly things, of which they claim to be the representatives, is manifestly absurd, nay more, impious. And hence we perceive the gross folly and wickedness of receiving human opinion as the standard of truth.



II. Again, God is the only Lawgiver. Not that He rules the universe, as some have profanely imagined, according to arbitrary caprice,—not that right is a mere emanation of power, and the Divine law a mere creature of the Divine will,—but that every perfection of truth, and goodness, and justice, and purity, and love, and beauty, and power are inherently and co-essentially eternal in the substance of the everlasting GODHEAD. God is His own law,—eternally, necessarily the same, from everlasting to everlasting! Inherently, essentially, He is the law Himself: relatively to His creatures, He is the Lawgiver by revealing Himself to them.

How monstrously profane, how utterly destitute of the semblance of a foundation, then, is that system, which would erect a standard of right and wrong *on* earth and *from* earth, *in* man and *of* man—instead of simply referring every moral dispute at once to Him who is in Himself the standard as well as the giver of all law!

Yet, if we look around us, we shall see that it is the general tendency of the present generation to appeal to public opinion instead of absolute truth, and to consider expediency as a profitable and laudable substitute for right. Yes, instead of seeking for the true and the right as inherent in, reflected from, or revealed by the One God, the philosopher of the nineteenth century points to the golden calves of public opinion and general expediency, and cries, in the fulness of sincere misbelief, These be thy gods, O Israel!

But is it only the philosopher, the politician, the heathen moralist, the material reformer, who appeals to these idols? Alas, no: the preachers of the Gospel, the Priests of the Church, the divines of this generation, and the teachers of that which is springing into life, are deeply impregnated with this enervating, misdirecting, and most accursed heresy.

But let us proceed to other points before we attempt to apply what we have said.

III. God is the source of all power—He *is* Power; the main-spring of all motion, and the life of all life. All the powers, and qualities, and tendencies, which we see in the material universe, are merely the outward signs of the one work carried on by the One Worker. It is, for example, no more necessary or, *per se*, likely, that fire should burn, or water quench, or air ascend, or lead descend, or that food should support life, or that eyes should see, or ears hear, or that herbs should grow, or flowers bloom,—than that the very opposite of all these laws should prevail: neither are these things regulations issued at some remote period from the throne of heaven; but they are merely universal

rules, by which, in each individual case, in each single, separate instance, God works His constant work according to His good pleasure. Strictly speaking, the qualities, and capacities, and tendencies of material nature, and of each element, and each atom, are only the manifestations of such and such stages in the process of causation carried on entirely and only by the power of Him who hath and who is power.

IV. Thus, too, in the economy of grace, though each created spirit is endowed with the awful gift of a monadic individualism, though each human being is made in the image of God, and consequently endued with freedom of will, so that he may either subject himself to the Divine influence, or reject it; still, all the means by which God works, are only second causes veiling the action of the first cause. Men indeed become, in a certain sense, individually speaking, independent agents in the spiritual struggle continually carried on; in that they are called fellow-workers with Christ in the work of the salvation of their brethren; but even here their sufficiency is of God. He is their strength; and, in other cases, those we mean which do not involve the individual volition of external and responsible agents, the case is clearer, simpler; all the means of grace, written or oral, visible or invisible, individual or general, internal or external,—in fact, all those ways, or courses, or objects, or subjects, or channels, or instruments, or circumstances, or influences by which God works in us or around us,—are only effective through His power, only operative through His will. It is He, and He only, who works in and by them, according to His good pleasure, selecting, according to His absolute purpose and creative choice, those vehicles of grace which He deigns to employ.

V. Again: God, as we have before observed in the language of the Divine Oracles, is alone King of kings and Lord of lords: all legitimate authority exists only with reference to Him; all *absolute* authority is centred in Him; all *relative* authority is delegated by Him; all dignity and pre-eminence of every sort or kind flows from the simple fountain of His ineffable will.

It is clear, then, that any assumption of authority or jurisdiction, dignity or pre-eminence, on the part of any human being, or collection of human beings, except as being the possessor or possessors of a *specific office* committed to him or them by God, and accompanied by a certain limited amount of delegated authority, jurisdiction, dignity, or pre-eminence, is an act of rebellion against the majesty of God, and one which partakes more or less of the nature of blasphemy. And it is also clear that every recognition or admission of such an assumption is more or less

idolatrous in itself, and has a further tendency to separate the soul from God.

VI. In Scripture, God is revealed to us not only as Truth and Law, as Power and Life, as King of kings and Lord of lords, but also as the Providential Governor and Director of all human events. "*A man's heart deviseth his way,*" says the Divine philosopher, "*but the Lord directeth his steps.*" Nor does this doctrine, as is ignorantly supposed, interfere with the free will or the free agency of man. It actually asserts the one, and practically enforces the other: it actually asserts the one by stating that "*a man's heart deviseth his way;*" and it practically enforces the other, inasmuch as it leaves us at perfect liberty to frame our actions according to our sense of duty, trusting solely to God for the event. Instead of binding us down to the wheels of expediency, and inviting us to the practice of mean arts and unworthy methods, the word of God, in its simple theocracy, allows us, invites us, commands us, urges us to do our duty as it plainly lies before us; cheering us when dejected, and checking us when overconfident, and warning us when we are tempted to do evil, that good may abound, to follow expediency rather than right, by the constantly repeated admonition, that however men may labour at the *means*, the end rests with God.

VII. After preferring such charges as these against the spirit of the present age as developed in all the schools of theology and philosophy with which we are acquainted, and as exemplified in the individual mind and character of almost every man around us, it may seem almost superfluous to bring forward yet another accusation of the same class. We feel, however, bound to advance it: the age we live in, and the individuals who compose it, ignore even when they do not deny, the omnipresence of God.

Take any ten men at random, and ask them what they mean by the Divine Omnipresence, and you will find that they entertain some vague notion of the *omniscience* of God, and confound or substitute this for His *omnipresence*. How far does this come short of the Truth! God is every where! The air we breathe, the ground we tread on, the sun that lights our path by day, the moon that dispenses her light by night, are instinct with Deity: not, as the Pantheist would have us believe, in their own nature or essence or being, but as the shreds of the raiment of HIM who clotheth Himself with light as with a garment. Nor is this all: God is absolutely, actually, PERSONALLY present every where: and—yet more stupendous thought—the whole of the universe which we inhabit, with all its myriad systems of matter, and millions of spiritual monads, does not fill even the hollow of His



hand, Whose Personal Being is as infinite as the eternity which HE inhabiteth.

We have gone into some detail on these few points, because we feel, that however true and indubitable in themselves, men are fast losing sight of them; and we proceed now to exemplify some of our general statements, illustrating them, for the most part, from the able work before us; a work for which Mr. Montgomery deserves the admiration and the gratitude of all those, who, in contradistinction to the scoff of the hostile few, or the silence of the abject many, attempt to repair the ruined altar of the Lord of Hosts; and boldly trust, that however many knees have bowed, or however many mouths may have kissed the idol of this world's adoration, still, if we are only true to our God, faithful to His Church, we may yet live to hear the vast multitude of our fellow-countrymen proclaim, as with one heart so with one mouth: *The Lord He is the God, the Lord He is the God.*

We regret that a work of such intense power and intrinsic excellence should be disfigured—as the volume before us so frequently is—by extraordinary phrases, ungainly expressions, outlandish words, and startling cacophonies. Mr. Montgomery's delight in the termination *ism* is very unpleasing, and at times really mars the sense as well as the beauty of some of the finest passages of this truly valuable work. We earnestly intreat him to alter these things in the next edition, and also to correct one or two cases of carelessness and misprint, which will not fail to arrest the attention of his readers. Thus he twice speaks of the Tower of Babel as ANTE *deluvian*, having evidently substituted one preposition for another in the MS., and neglected to correct it in the proof.

But let us to our subject, and exhibit some of the errors of the age inconsistent with a due realization of the Divine truths which we have enunciated.

I. By failing to realize the fact, that not only is truth an attribute, or, if we may be allowed the expression, a condition, of the Godhead, but that God is actually Truth, we arrive at a most inadequate notion of the reality, the supremacy, the eternity, the divinity of truth. In fact, we virtually lose sight of its real nature, and consider that which is the very substance of all substance as a mere shadow.

How strikingly this is the case in almost every religious, or moral school, or circle, or dissertation, or discussion of the present day, will appear to any one who impartially examines the subject.

Men seldom argue with the conviction before their eyes, that the truth which they are contending about is an eternal reality, is in fact their God. If such were their conviction, they would feel

that they were on the holiest ground, they would feel the awfulness, the responsibility of what they were doing and saying; they would not be anxious either to convince others or themselves, so much as to obtain a clear vision of the truth, they would not use casuistic chicanery or rhetorical flourish, or ridicule, or invective;—they would, on the contrary, feel that all such words, and phrases, and arguments, belonged to that class of which men shall give an account on the day of judgment.

Again, how could latitudinarianism prevail, either formally or virtually, together with the conviction of the real substantive nature, and eternal, and Divine dignity of truth?—the thing is impossible.

Again, how could those who profess a zeal for God's truth, enounce the monstrous absurdity, that every man has a right to interpret the Bible as he pleases, and that he will be judged not by that Holy Volume, *rightly* interpreted, but by any interpretation which he chooses to put upon it, if they really believed in the substantive existence, the Divine nature of truth?

“The Word of God must not be considered merely as a magical power, a spiritual influence, or moral instrument, but rather as an inspired medium of divine language, through which the Trinity in covenant accord the faculties of man, when duly conditioned for hearing and understanding their august appeal.

“‘He that is of God heareth God's words.’ (John viii. 47.) Let it be remembered, then, that the bare perusal of the oracles of God will never, as such, render the reader ‘wise unto salvation.’ To understand this in a practical light, Scripture must be distinguished as to its own nature, absolutely regarded, and as to its relative influence when humanly applied. Touching the former, the perfect glories of revelation cannot be really modified by the imperfect faculties which they accost. They have their primal root in the Almighty, and their perfect result in eternity; and whether we scorn their claims or submit to their appeal, they remain in themselves the very counterpart of that Divine wisdom which they infallibly image forth, and express. This unalterable sublimity of the Bible cannot be too seriously, or too frequently, maintained. It is the very mouth of God, the mind of the Holy Ghost; and, albeit it comes to man clothed with mortal condescensions, derived from earth, and sense, and time, it still bears in every feature the heavenly trace of its true original,—even that Everlasting Reason who is ‘the only wise God.’

“But as regards the relative influence of the Bible, just as beams of pure and perfect light, in passing through some coloured medium, appear to be modified by their passage, so do the revealings of Scripture, in their transit through the consciousness of man, seem to be hued by the moral condition and intellectual bias of the individual faculties through which they have to shine. How solemnly, then,

ought we to approach the 'lively oracles!' They will not really be known unless truly loved; and never can they be truly loved without that hidden preparation of the heart which descends from the intercession of our great High Priest above. We must draw nigh to this mental shrine of the Almighty, this temple of words, where the majesty of infinite reason dwells and speaks, with reverence and awe, with humility, faith, modesty, and prayer. Moreover, we must keep a most jealous watch on the peculiar temperament of our hearts, and the prevailing tone of our minds, lest, after all, we virtually communicate ourselves unto Scripture instead of permitting Scripture to impart its spirit unto us. We are all by nature radically corrupt; and this corruption itself does not cease to realize its abiding character, because we place our hearts and minds in outward connexion with the grammatical meaning of Scripture. On the part, too, of many who profess to venerate the word of God, is to be found an excess of morbid egotism, an intensity of intellectual and religious self, which causes the Bible not so much to reflect the Divine ideas, as to become the troubled mirror of a man's own individualism. This popular and prevailing confusion between Scripture, regarded as the objective representation of eternal wisdom and truth, and the same volume considered in the subjective interpretation of man's personal understanding, will explain some of the leading fallacies which belong to the controversies of the Church in all ages. As respects, for instance, the grand question, 'What is the rule of faith?' a stern and staunch Protestant accuses the Romanist of reducing Scripture to a nullity or mere name, by adding thereto a vague and vast tradition which can never be determined, and by imposing the authority of an elastic convenience, a personified abstraction, a formless and indefinite reality, called 'his Church!' On the other hand, how seldom does the unwise glorifier of private judgment, in the pride of his protest, and in the passion of his zeal, remember, that mistaken liberty in reading Scripture often leads a sectarian disposition to Papal tyranny in the interpretation of the same! In short, what by theory ecclesiastical infallibility is to an implicit Romanist, intellectual confidence becomes to an undisciplined Protestant when personal reason is exalted into a virtual Pope.

"Again: this confusion between a rule of faith objectively revealed by God to man, and the same rule subjectively interpreted among mankind, throws light on the baseless argument, whereby heresy and schism have often sought to protect their cause and justify their existence. Every reader is competent to prove this by recalling to his mind certain eras of the Church, when passion, pride, and prejudice, political anarchy, and social disorganization clothed their crimes with the very language of Scripture—with the mental and moral drapery of the Holy Ghost. . . . Let us, then, beware of what 'manner of spirit we are of,' and how far or not we dictate mind and meaning to the Scriptures, instead of allowing them to dictate saving truth unto us. Venerate the Bible by all means; it is a volume so infinitely precious, pure, and important, that He who inspired it is alone competent to



appreciate it. . . . But while this, and far more than finite eloquence could express, may be attributed to the Bible, the distinction is again to be remembered between what it is in itself as a clear and unclouded radiance in which God has mirrored His own mind,—and what it becomes to us, when interpreted and applied through the dim medium of our individuality.”—pp. 5—8.

Again, if men had been taught to appreciate and accustomed to contemplate the substantive existence, the immutable eternity, the Divine personality of truth, they would never have produced or listened to the doctrine of Development—its infidel and atheistic tendency would have revolted them—they would have seen, that he who denied the immutability of Divine Truth, denied, by implication, the immutability of God—they would have perceived at once, that truth is not truth unless it be eternal; and that if there be no truth, there is no God. The doctrine, the system, the feelings which dictated it, the arguments which supported it, would at once have been scouted as intrinsically impious.

The same condemnation applies, though in a less degree, to all paltering or dallying with error—particularly the errors of Rome. If those who, having been taught the truth, had really believed it to be true—had really thought every thing inconsistent with it to be false—they would never have learnt first to palliate, then to tolerate, and finally embrace that or any other system of falsehood. We are not speaking of those who have been brought over by simple conviction, *if such there be*, but of those who, though knowing and believing certain doctrines and practices to be erroneous, gradually accustomed themselves to the contemplation of them, till by consuetude they embraced them. In all such cases we say, that these men did not really believe the truth which they abandoned—never had duly received the truth which they renounced.

Another line of reasoning adopted, another argument listened to by those who have either wavered in or deserted their allegiance to the Church, has shown an equal misapprehension, misappreciation of the nature of truth—we allude to the plea, so often advanced in favour of medieval corruptions on the ground of their *prevalence*,—they *are*, and *therefore* they ought to be—this is the naked argument; or the majority of Christendom believes them, therefore they must be true—a very logical application of Horne Tooke’s reasoning: Truth is what one troweth; the majority of Christians troweth that creatures should be adored, idols worshipped, &c.,—therefore these things are true!

Such an argument, we repeat, could find no reception, could produce no effect, could be considered as nothing but an auda-

cious act of impious rebellion with any one who duly estimated the *nature*, much more the PERSON of truth.

We will touch briefly on the political questions connected with this view: suffice it to say, that they who believed in the inviolable nature of truth;—they, in fact, who believed really and honestly in any thing at all, however they might differ as to the civil or political privileges or immunities to be conferred on recusants from the national Church; could have no possible doubt whatever, that it was the solemn duty of the State to uphold the truth; that it was bound by the most stringent obligations to propagate what was true, and with equal stringency forbidden from propagating that which was false.

II. But we proceed to another point—the reality, the immutability, the eternity, the DEITY of Right. The opinion, alas! of the Epicurean sensualist—“*utilitas prope et mater æqui*”—is so generally admitted, that it is held to be a treason against the spirit of the age, to make any appeal from the tribunal of *Expediency*, except to that of *Public Opinion*: and yet the devotion given to these two idols is utterly inconsistent with a due appreciation of JEHOVAH, as the LAW or the Lawgiver. We cannot imagine any man, really believing God to be the Law of the Universe, by which, that is by Himself manifested to His creatures, He will judge them, ever, for one moment, losing sight of so awful so tremendous a fact, much less attempting to erect any other standard or rule of action.

We could also add, that the notion of expediency involves a misapprehension of the relative position and value of inferior causes, and a neglect of the one only cause. It ignores the fact, so nobly expressed by the Psalmist: “Except the Lord build the house, their labour is but lost that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.”

They who make *expediency* their *end*, finalize second causes, and consequently labour under a mistake, which, fatal in this world, will be doubly so hereafter.

The reference, too, constantly made, the deference constantly vaunted, to *public opinion*<sup>1</sup>, is another proof of the absence in men's minds of a living consciousness of God as personal truth and personal law. How would men dare to appeal to the

<sup>1</sup> In America this has been carried out to its fullest extent. We quote the words of Fennimore Cooper, in one of his latest works:—

“So much are the Americans accustomed to refer the decision of nearly all questions to numbers, it scarcely exaggerates the truth to say that, on the stand, the opinion of half-a-dozen country surveyors touching a problem in geometry, would be very apt to overshadow that of a professor from West Point or Old Yale. Majorities are the *primum mobile* of the common mind, and he who can get the greatest number on his side is very apt to be considered right, and to reap the benefit of being so.”—*The Ways of the Hour*, vol. i, p. 101.

temporary and fugitive decisions of public opinion, if they really believed in the substantive, much more the personal existence of truth and right?—it is monstrous :—

“What, then, shall we say to that mawkish and miserable philosophy of the age, which brands with the epithets ‘bigoted,’ ‘assuming,’ and ‘audacious,’ all brave-hearted and deep-toned assertions of a religious creed and a moral science, in opposition to the reigning Pyrrhonism around us? Men are sent into our world to fight *against* the world, the flesh, and the devil; and whenever the first sanctions practice, the second indulgences, and the third tendencies, which are contrary to revealed truth, and Christ’s Church, no pusillanimous alarms about ‘bigotry and intolerance’ should tempt us to a vile neutrality, and a villanous indifference. Truth can only be uncharitable to falsehood, and principle intolerant only unto expediency; and, therefore, in denouncing what Christ and His Church have condemned, and in upholding what the Divine Word hath proclaimed, there can be no real uncharitableness towards man. On the contrary, the truly uncharitable are those who leave men to perish in their sins, rather than risk offending their pride; and the really illiberal are those dastardly minds, who would sacrifice ‘the truth as it is in Jesus,’ for any popular lie, or fashionable maxim, which antinomianism of politics, literature, or society, may choose to promulgate or adopt. Against this hardened and heartless compromise of truth and principle, for the sake of a false charity, and a fictitious liberalism, God and nature, reason and revelation, loudly and perpetually exclaim. Nature herself is, as it were, Athanasian in the nicety and exactness of her distinctions and exclusions. All her works and ways are those of decidedness: there is no indifference about her laws; and if you dare to infringe her institutes, or to violate her canons, a recoil will be felt, which makes both mind and body perceive that decision and definitiveness belong to her constitution. Providence also declares there is no middle path between virtue and vice, truth and falsehood, right and wrong; and as for the doctrines of revelation, they pronounce a cold neutrality and a dead indifference to be rebellion towards Christ, and treason to His cause. But the prevailing sentiment of the times is at variance with this. A mock idol, a miserable impostor, a heartless cheat, under the soothing name of ‘liberality,’ is doing all it can to dishonour God, confound distinctions, annihilate moral certainties, and so to deal with Christianity and the Church, as if the former of these were an historical problem, and the latter the mere creation of the subjective conscience and will. The object of this revolting tendency is obvious enough,—to expel ‘*the truth*’ from the world, and leave every individual mind to discover its *own* truth, declare its own God, imagine its own Christ, construct its own creed, fabricate its own Church, and thus introduce a pandemonium of human selfishness at last! Against this lying spirit and infidel abomination the heroic disciple of the Cross will set his face ‘like a flint,’ and rather die at his post, than be



morally indifferent, or spiritually dead towards any one essential truth, principle, or practice, concerning which the God of the universe hath spoken out. Heaven's decisions are earth's certainties; and he who by faith knows the one, can never, in fact, dispute the other." —pp. 166, 167.

III. But not alone on these points, vital though they be, has our age, in its general tone of thought and feeling, departed from that pure and simple and all-embracing and all-satisfying theocracy, which is the essence of all true religion, whether revealed in nature or in Scripture.

"If we avert our eyes from Scripture, we perceive that, since the close of the eighteenth century, a peculiar style of allusion to Divine agency in the world has been introduced into physical science and natural theology. The divines unto whom we refer were scholastic defenders of Christian evidences, and, we doubt not, did no small service to the outworks of the faith. But, it must be admitted, their cold, dry, and technical division of the Divine Nature into an orderly analysis of abstract properties, introduced a style of thought and speech touching the Supreme Being, which has led thousands to confound philosophical theism with the 'God and Father of Jesus Christ.' And thus there have been since their time, and *are* in this present era, heresies propounded, which virtually untenant creation of its over-watching God, and leave its inhabitants to be the victims of a fatherless and forgotten world. According to this doctrine, our human system is little more than a stupendous masterpiece of material and moral mechanism; a vast machine, as it were, compounded of matter and mind, which, having been originally constructed for certain purposes, and endowed with corresponding attributes for self-conduct and self-expansion, is now left by its Almighty Architect to work out and work on as long as the mechanism can contrive to last. How men who profess to be guided by mere reason can allow themselves to be cheated by such profane Deism as this, surpasses our comprehension. Never has the Christless imposture of scientific terms and abstract personifications been more successful than when it tempts us to believe that passive causation will alone explain active effect. Why cannot these victims of philosophy admit, that 'gravitation,' 'attraction,' 'electricity,' 'course of nature,' 'laws of matter,' &c. &c. &c., are mere words, that serve to personify human ignorance, but which leave unexplained the real nature, course, and action of a single phenomenon in materialism, that science detects, or the senses can discern? The writers and lecturers to whom we chiefly allude speak of attributes, properties, and laws as vicarious agencies, unto which God hath so committed the operations of matter, that He Himself can personally recede into His eternity, and reign in awful indifference on His invisible throne. Thus it is that, while a living, personal, and omnipresent God in the Bible is ever represented as the grand explanation, origin, and cause of all that is

absolutely good, the leading systems of the age describe the world as merely regulated by abstract laws and impersonal attributes. But, in fact, this style of nomenclature is little more than a respectable way of excluding God's ruling law and personal will from the active doings and daily conduct of mankind. Sinful as men are, they have still a feeling for the Infinite, the Eternal, the Vast, and the Invisible ; and all the instinctive poetry of human nature responds to visions of ideal glory and abstract magnificence. Moreover, curiosity is keenly excited, intellect gratified, and the imagination profoundly overawed by a display of material wonders and physical mysteries. Nor do they dislike to hear a scientific orator eloquently declaim on the 'Presiding Mind,' 'Infinite Wisdom,' 'Creative Power and Goodness,' &c. &c. And why is this? Because wisdom, power, and goodness are mere impersonal things,—ideal properties, about which the intellect can occupy itself, and the reasoning powers be interested, without the faintest demand being thereby made on the conscience, will, and character of man. In short, while in Scripture what we term 'Nature' is God in personal action, and 'Providence' God in personal legislation, Nature and Providence, in the leading systems of the times, are philosophic refuges, which are conveniently adopted to keep God's personal will and word from actual interference with man's deeds and designs. In Scripture the perfections of Deity are ever described in vital connexion with His Infinite Personality, and hence they stand in direct relation to our duties and destinies. But, in the fashionable science of the day, while the attributes of the Divine Being are paraded before us with much seeming reverence and wonder, they exist apart from all responsibility ; they reach not to our conscience, they appeal not to our responsibilities, and apply to no point in our moral character. Thus, the God of science is quite distinct from the God of Scripture : as the former, He is a mere collective unity of impersonal attributes, which may interest our contemplation ; but as the latter, He is a Personal Being, holy, awful, ever-present, and ever-active, whose will and word reveal themselves through His ministers, and declare what is *our* responsible connexion with His Perfections, both now and hereafter. In science, we learn to speculate and admire ; but in revelation, we are commanded to adore, believe, and obey."—pp. 152—155.

Such is a painful but a true picture of the line of thought and tone of feeling universally prevalent. We talk of elements as if necessarily existing ; of the qualities of matter as if essentially inherent ; of events, as if the undirected results of human agency ; of means, as if they were the causes of those ends which, in the Divine economy, they happen to subserve or precede.

The material universe, however, ought not to be looked upon only as the ever-moving work of God ; it is also the ever-speaking voice of God. The forms of material existence are cast in the moulds of spiritual truth ; the visible creation is but the outward manifestation of the invisible God.

“Matter as well as mind, body, and spirit, contemplated in their pure essence or absolute products, have both emanated from the creative wisdom of the Almighty. Moreover He who came to die on earth, that His redeemed Church might be incorporated with Him in heaven by spiritual life for ever, has put a mysterious glory on materialism, by assuming unto His incarnate person as God-Man, a portion of that very dust out of which our own corporeal frames are organized and made. There seems, then, to be one of those deep harmonies which characterize all methods of divine self-manifestation, in the fact, that our Saviour, both in His parables and homilies, caused the forms of visible nature to adumbrate and expound the faculties and feelings of the invisible soul. Doubtless, too, the highest functions of what science calls ‘nature,’ are alone fulfilled, when this material phenomena are enlisted into the service of spiritual mystery and moral truth. And let us add another thought before the subject closes. The popular criticism on the style in which the Holy Ghost hath been pleased to apparel His written mind in Scripture, is perhaps somewhat defective in reverence of tone when it touches on the figurative language of the Bible. The general impression which it is calculated to produce amounts to this,—that the inspired organs of the Spirit sought to illustrate abstract truths according to the poetic idealism, or oriental richness of their own suggestive fancies.

“But surely it hath a deeper view, and breathes a diviner philosophy to say that, inasmuch as God created all things ‘for’ Christ (see Col. i. 16), the law of analogy which enables matter to illustrate mind, is a predestined result of the Divine will. In other words, the outward system of material things which accosts the senses in the natural world, is a vast and varied parable, through which the Holy Spirit instructs man’s embodied soul concerning the hidden secrets of the spiritual world.”—p. 33.

IV. Strange and senseless as it is that men should lose sight of the living presence, the effective energy of God in the world of matter, it is yet more so that they should do this in the world of grace; and yet, a very little examination of the subject, casting aside all party bias, will show us how general such a habit of thought has become. How many, alas! are there who look upon the Church or the Sacraments, or the Bible, or faith, as the *efficient* instead of the *instrumental* causes of man’s salvation! How many are there who look on justification as the causeless operation of an impersonal law; on the atonement as a fact existing independent of an agent; on sanctification as the involuntary effect of a mere influence! God the Father is too frequently looked on merely as an atheistic first cause; God the Son, as the combination of certain qualities and conditions without an individual will; God the Holy Ghost, as a spiritual emanation from the fountain of Deity, devoid of inherent power, volition, or personality.



If men could be induced to look through the means of grace on the God of whose grace they are the means simply of and by His will, there would be much less both of formalism and of rationalism than there now is ; much less of formalism, because men would not obscure the vision of the Godhead by those means which are ordained to communicate His presence ; much less of rationalism, because men would feel that there could not be any thing incongruous in His selecting any of the works of His hands as the channels of His mercy, or the tokens of His power.

“ All objections to a regenerating process, derived from rationalistic views concerning the element of water and the agency of the minister are untenable. For instance, it appears an impious irreverence, and almost a profane treatment of divine mysteries, when men reason thus : ‘ What ! do you believe that a little water sprinkled by the hand of an ordained sinner can regenerate the infant ? ’ This is not only irreverence, but untruth. No Churchman asserts that water regenerates, as an efficient means or elemental cause ; but what he maintains is, that the Spirit of God, in Baptism, consecrates water to be an ‘ outward sign,’ which veils the mysterious process of an ‘ inward grace.’

“ The humility of an earthly element cannot be safely objected to as an argument against the majesty of an heavenly operation. Nature itself is one immense symbolism, that is to say, it is the palpable clothing of certain almighty ideas in material forms, and which, as visible tokens, accost the senses, and through such sensitive medium appeal finally to the inner reason and central soul of man. Let it, above all, be remembered, that materialism has been everlastingly consecrated unto some ineffable functions, by being adopted into corporate union with the glorious person of the Incarnated God. He did ‘ not abhor the Virgin’s womb ’ (*Te Deum*). Moreover, man’s body was originally moulded out of materialism ; and perchance the mysterious combination of his own spiritual principle—a mind, with a body of organized flesh,—is almost as inexplicable as the conjunction of sacramental grace with an element of water. Again, when rationalistic scepticism sneers at the idea of water being instrumentally consecrated into the service of the Spirit, it is forgotten that the converting agency of a preached Gospel works through the medium of air, before the syllables of life come into contact with the soul.”—p. 300.

V. It is not wonderful that an age, which has ceased to look upon God as Truth and Law, as Power and Life, should go on to ignore His character as sole Monarch of the universe : it is however equally true, that unless we do realize the fact, that the universe is a kingdom, and that Jehovah is its king, we fall below the level of pure theism. It is the preservation of this great truth in all its vital energy which gives to the Mohammedan apostasy that living power over the acts and thoughts of its votaries, which so constantly arrests the attention of Christian

travellers. It is the gradual abandonment of this doctrine, its practical abandonment we mean, by the great majority of Christian nations, that assists, as much as any thing else, the instability of purpose and unreality of principle which meet us on every side. Without this crowning article of the theocratic creed, this cornerstone of the theocratic system, the social and political existence of mankind is so much practical atheism embodied in the forms of life and institutions of society. He who believes that he has a right to authority or dignity of any sort, except in virtue of an office specifically delegated to him from on high by the only King, believes what is both impious and absurd ; and he who recognizes any final authority in man, he who contemplates any human authority without referring it to its Divine source, and obeys or reverences it as a final tribunal ; or, again, he who pays deference to any power which is not delegated from on high, is guilty more or less of sin, of the sin of giving to the creature that honour which belongs alone to the Creator, who is over all God blessed for ever.

This Kingship of God has been more or less maintained or denied in various ages—and various causes have led to its prevalence or retrocession. In the early days of Christianity, it had such a power over the language, as well as the lives of the brethren, that they were falsely accused of insubordination to their earthly rulers. It was strongly maintained, in after-times, and sincerely embraced by the first Teuton converts : but the oligarchical system of the Middle Ages, together with the usurpations of Rome, had well-nigh swept this vital doctrine from the face of the earth ; for the irresponsible authority and segregative tyranny of the nobles, on the one hand, and the blasphemous assumption of absolute spiritual and moral jurisdiction, on the other, interposed impassable barriers between the creature and its Creator, the sinner and its Saviour, the subject and its Sovereign, the soul and its God.

In this age of thick darkness—we are speaking now of England—and thinking of the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation, when the causes above referred to had had time and opportunity to bear fruit—the royal power became the last refuge, the only surviving witness for the Sovereignty of God ; for our kings claimed a power officially delegated from on high to them as the responsible viceroys of their heavenly Master. They did not claim to be the substitutes, but the inferior officers of heaven ; and thus the kingly power and kingly claim kept alive in the minds of men a recognition of a mighty truth which they were fast losing.

This great fact of the theocratic nature and claims of the

English monarchy, accounts to our minds, most satisfactorily, for the sympathy and co-operation which was so strong and so successful between our monarchs and our Reformers, and likewise for the cordial union which so long subsisted between our Church and our State. The principles, the doctrines of the English Church were, and are, purely theocratic in contradistinction to the various systems of error which asserted the finality, or denied the delegation of the Divine authority. The principles of our Constitution, and those too of our great statesmen, were absolutely theocratic, for a long time after the Reformation.

It was loyalty to the throne of heaven, which led Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, to the stake; it was loyalty to the throne of heaven, which rallied the people of England, under Elizabeth and James the First, against their popish enemies.

It was loyalty to the throne of heaven, a conviction that he held a power entrusted from on high—a conviction of delegated authority and individual responsibility—which enabled Charles the Martyr to die—he went to the block not as an earthly king, but as a heavenly subject—not as a stubborn master of men, but as a faithful servant of God.

Nor did his enemies ignore the fundamental article for which we are contending. They maintained most earnestly and most sincerely the Sovereignty of God—the sole majesty, the sole dignity, the sole Kingship of Jehovah. They maintained that all authority must be referable to, and derivable from, the Lord of Hosts, though they declined to recognize that authority in either the Lord's Church or the Lord's anointed. In fact, they admitted the major, whilst denying the minor premiss of the royalist syllogism.

That such principles, or feelings, or notions, are now prevalent, or even *tolerated*, in an age which boasts of its tolerance, and which, to do it justice, *does* tolerate every conceivable system, or opinion, or creed—except that of theocracy—no one will presume to assert.

Take, for instance, the origin, nature, and extent of political power—though this is only one branch of the subject. One man tells you, that the people is the only legitimate source of power; another speaks of the “enlightened few,” or the “educated classes,” or the “higher orders,” as the legitimate rulers of the land, adopting a kind of social angelolatry or political polytheism; a third treats political institutions as mere matters of chance, the result—as the more plain-spoken and therefore more honest atheist would say—of a fortuitous concatenation of atoms.

So much for the origin of power. As to its nature and extent, we hear much of the omnipotence of Parliament. Does this



mean that our legislators are free to act like gods, according to their unbiassed judgment and unrestrained will, so that their decrees are the simple expression of the uninfluenced decision of the majority? No; the operation of this omnipotence is limited, or rather, we should say, directed, by internal influences of numberless and conflicting kinds. There is, in fact, *nothing* which may not legitimately be brought to bear upon any supposable question, and rightly and naturally exfluence any or every member of either house in giving his vote,—except the will of God; for whilst abjectly cringing to the opinion of the creature, the legislator ignores the law of the Creator. Man may be allowed to encroach on that collective omnipotence, which must be stringently maintained only in reference to the Almighty. Every voice may be listened to, every word allowed its due weight, except the voice of the Church, and the Word of God.

It is strange to us that professing Christians, decent, respectable men, such as the late member for Tamworth, should legislate without any reference to the day of reckoning. It is clear that they cannot admit the doctrine for which we are pleading,—the sole sovereignty, the universal monarchy of God; otherwise, they would feel that political power is an official trust, delegated by THE KING, and that to use it without constant reference to Him, is *treasonable*, as well as impious.

We are told that principles are nothing, that results are every thing,—a doctrine as materially pernicious, as it is morally unsound. Yet let us look back to the time when every other throne was humbled, every other land deluged with blood. What was it which, *humanly speaking*,—for we are wishing to argue the point materially, and not providentially,—saved the English people from ruin, and the English Crown from humiliation?—It was that he, who ruled that people, and wore that crown, “the good old king,” believed in the creed, and acted on the system of theocracy. We do not assert that all his views were sound, or all his actions good; but we do assert that it was a constant, living, guiding, ruling consciousness of his own true position, as the divinely-appointed possessor of a delegated and responsible power, *as the officer of a theocracy*, which enabled him to stem the torrent, and repel the surge, before which the oldest and proudest trees of the forest were but as the stubble scattered by the wind.

Nobly has our author expressed himself upon this subject:—

“God is as truly the Almighty Head of a commonwealth, as He is the Creator and Governor of individual souls, whose united aggregate composes what we term a polity, or the corporate unity of a state.

Hence, on the hypothesis that it has pleased the Divine Being to make a formal revelation of His will unto mankind, it might be concluded beforehand, such revelation will address itself not exclusively unto the subjective consciousness of individual men, but unto the personality and responsibility of nations. To adopt another creed, and affirm the religion of Christ to be limited unto the sanctuary of a man's own spirit, and that as a member of a polity, a citizen in the commonwealth, his creed has no legitimate realm for unfolding its principles, is indeed to assert an individual ought to be religious, but society atheistical! To this heartless falsehood does the watchword of creedless democracy and parliamentary deism lead at last,—that motto, we mean, whose doctrine is,—‘Politics and religion have nothing to do with each other.’ Translate that paradox into a true and ultimate principle, and it amounts unto this revolting conclusion,—‘Society and God have no moral relation unto each other!’ And such is the impious dislike certain men feel towards the character of an ordered Church, the claims of an Apostolic priesthood, and the obligations of a definite creed, that, rather than submit their secular policy unto the test of spiritual wisdom, they are prepared to exclude the Almighty from all Scriptural interference with national duties and public responsibilities. According to their dreadful theory, in political life the more we approximate unto pure atheism, the nearer we approach unto the perfect ideal of a modern philanthropist, and liberal statesman!”—pp. 176, 177.

Let it not be supposed that in putting forward the dignity of the regal office, we advocate either despotism or absolutism. Despotism, *i. e.* the government of one or more according to his or their own will, without established law, is a practical denegation of more than one essential principle of theocracy. And though an absolute monarchy, or the rule of one according to fixed laws, is far preferable to either autocratic or democratic despotism; still the most perfect government, and that most consonant both essentially and actually with a practical theocracy, is one where the sovereign, representing individually the dignity of God, shares with her subjects that power of which he or she is the supreme head.

Again, the present age is peculiarly neglectful of the duties of children to their parents. The thing is so plain, the fact is so general, that we need bring no proof to show how this fault, both in principle and practice, pervades all orders of the community. Nor is it only that children fail to see in their parents God's special officers, appointed by Him even before their birth, as their rulers as well as guardians; but parents also for the most part have forgotten the responsibility of their office—have forgotten that their duties to their children are as clearly official

duties as those of a clerk in a public office to his under-clerks. Even in those cases where authority, or respect, or any other portion of the claims resulting *by Divine appointment* from the parental and filial relation, are claimed or exercised, admitted or practised—the Divine source, the purely theocratic nature of these duties, is in most cases altogether ignored. The parent too often exercises authority from self-will, the child yields obedience from necessity or habit; or where, as is, of course, very frequently the case, affection has its share, and perhaps the greater share in these results, the claims and rights of the All-father are forgotten. Nay, even in those cases where a sense of duty has its effect on the children, it is too often a blind instead of enlightened sense—one which views in the parent the final seat instead of the delegated abode of authority. In fact, parents and children, whatever be their feelings or conduct towards each other, seldom contemplate, and still less frequently realize the fact that they are the officers and subordinates of a pure theocracy.

Again, in the economic relations of life, how very rarely does it occur, that the employer and the employed recognize in the least degree the official and theocratic nature of the connexion in which they are placed! How seldom, for instance, does the master of a household, or the occupier of a farm, consider himself as the officer of a theocracy, as appointed by his MASTER to superintend those subjected to his authority; an authority officially and directly delegated by the ALMIGHTY in his Pantocratic capacity, as possessed of a certain jurisdiction, forming part of the government of the universe, to be exercised according to the laws, and in furtherance of the principles, of the Universal King! How seldom does he consider that he will have to give an account of the way in which he has administered this office, as a sacred trust committed to him for the moral and material well-being, for the eternal felicity and the temporal happiness of those allotted to his charge!

How seldom is this, the true view of the case, taken by the subordinate! how seldom does the inferior recognize in the economic ruler a minister of God!—Yet such views as these are true, for they are taught by the Bible, and enforced by the Church.

Again, in matters ecclesiastical: how very little reverence or deference is paid, generally speaking, to the Bishop, *as Bishop!* Men may, indeed, obey a Bishop from love, or fear, or interest, or admiration of his talent, or accordance with his views: but how very few are there who look upon the Bishop in his official capacity as

ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΑΝΤΙ ΤΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ.

Anointed instead of The Anointed, and reverence him for his



office' sake without reference to himself ! But, that it is our duty to do this as far as possible cannot for an instant be denied by any consistent Churchman.

Again, let us consider the relation in which the Clergy stand to their flocks, and we shall see how frequently both pastor and people ignore the theocratic nature of that relation. Too frequently the laity refuse to recognize in God's ordained minister the possessor of any spiritual office or divine jurisdiction,—a habit of thought and feeling which is encouraged by the loose and inadequate views entertained by many of the priesthood themselves. Too often, again, is deference given on the one hand, and received on the other, not as the result of a spiritual relation, but of a temporal difference ; not because the clergyman is the overseer of his flock, but because he is superior to them in some of the advantages or ornaments of this present world ; so that frequently the very respect which is apparently given to God's minister is only a tribute to the "pride of life." And even in those cases where the nature of the pastoral relation is recognized as being of a spiritual character, the priest or the preacher is elevated into an idol,—the authority is recognized, but the AUTHOR is practically forgotten, and the creature is worshipped in conjunction with, and not unfrequently to the exclusion of, the Creator.

And before leaving this point, on which we have already dilated to a greater length than we had intended, let us again refer to the sad course of those who have deserted the fold of our Holy mother.

We do not believe that any one who had been duly instructed, and had duly learnt to realize this doctrine of the sole sovereignty of God, could by any possibility be induced to go over to a Church, which both invades that sovereignty in her own person by claiming a final instead of a responsible authority, an absolute instead of a conditional obedience, and also clearly and unmistakably gives to another a portion of that honour which God has explicitly declared that He will not share with another.

We need scarcely add, that they who have left our pale for any of the many self-sown sects which surround us, can never have acknowledged the fact that God has delegated His Sovereignty in matters spiritual to His Church, and to Her alone ; that they who deny her authority are guilty of disobedience, and that they who claim such for themselves are guilty of rebellion,—such disobedience or rebellion being committed against *Her* and *their* LORD.

VI. On the sixth point at issue between us and the present age, we could easily establish our case were we necessitated to do so. The case is, however, too plain to need substantiation. Men do undoubtedly believe, not professed atheists, but professing

Christians, that events are the *creations* of actions,—not merely the permitted result, but the necessary effect. On the fatal error, the God-denying tendency, of this the popular view, we will not enlarge at present; for there are still, we believe, and we thank God for the conviction, many men who still sincerely maintain the truth on this point; and yet how few are there of the Church's champions—(is there *one* among the state's rulers? one political leader? one man in public life?)—who really believes it? although without believing it, none believes rightly in God. No; men would never worship expediency if they had not previously deified second cause. The age must choose,—the sooner the better,—between theocracy and atheism.

VII. Denying, as it does, the theocratic principles which we have already brought forward, it is natural that the present age should reject altogether that which even further humbles the creature, and exalts the Creator—the doctrine of the Divine omnipresence, the belief that God is every where, not virtually, not potentially, not providentially, not only in His might, His power, His knowledge, or His will, but actually and absolutely, essentially and personally. Yet such is the truth.—We are but powerless atoms floating in the infinite ocean of personal Deity.

Let us sum up and once more declare those theocratic principles for which we are contending:—

I. God is Truth,—eternal, immutable, substantive, personal truth. All forms around us are but the creations of His will, the shadows of His reality—all opinions, and systems, and thoughts, and convictions are proportionally true as they reflected Him, proportionally false as they fail to do so.

II. God is Law,—in the enduring and unchangeable, beginningless and endless Now, which knows not time and embraces eternity, one and the same, without succession or growth, or progress, or mutation, uncreated and imperishable. Right is accordance with Him, wrong is discordance from Him.

III. God is power,—Life is His energy, growth His volition, capacity His gift, operation His command. The elements of matter, the powers of nature, are in themselves nothing; at first the creatures of His will, they are still the vehicles of His free pleasure.

IV. God is the Personal life of the soul. As He imparts Himself or refrains, the soul lives or dies. Man is free to seek, and he who seeketh findeth; man is free to reject and to fall back to perdition: but whether called for, or uncalled; whether from without, or from within; whether by His Bible or His Church, His servants or His Sacraments; whether by the works of nature, or the machinery of Providence; whether by grief or by

joy, by friend or by foe, by example or by warning ;—it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure.

V. God is KING. We are all merely monads in the countless catalogue of creation—subjects of one Almighty Lord. All lawful power, or authority, or supremacy, must be and is officially delegated by Him to those whom, directly or indirectly, He appoints as the superior or inferior officers in that vast theocracy of which He is the only ruler. All assumption, therefore, of final jurisdiction is blasphemy, whether by prince or people, Church or State ; all denial of the legitimate rights of official authority, civil or ecclesiastical, is impiety as well as rebellion. All claim to power or authority, except as the delegated official of God, is groundless and profane.—Nay, further, all pride or self-complacency in our own worldly advantages, all delight in making others humble themselves in any way or any degree to us as the possessors of any such advantages, all glorying in our own capacities, or capabilities, or gifts, natural or artificial, spiritual or temporal, *as though they were our own*, are actual sins in the sight of Him who alone possesseth all power, dominion, might, and majesty.

VI. God is alone the disposer of all events. Every attempt, therefore, to compass future good at the expense of present evil, and obtain that which *seems* desirable by the sacrifice of that which *is* right, is not only a gross mistake as regards man, but a gross outrage as regards God ; for it denies His power, and invades His prerogative ; it mentally unseats Him from His throne, and places man on it instead of His Maker.

VII. God is around and about us, within and without, above and beneath us. We float in a circumfluent eternity and infinity of personal being. It is not only that God sees us, hears us, knows us, searches and watches over the work of His hands, the visible and invisible creation with which we are surrounded, but that in the boundlessness of His divinity, He actually *is* every where. And hence we learn, that nature is not only an unwritten bible, a material parable, but that it is actually the visible, though only faint and partial manifestation of His truth, and law, and power, and life, and reign, and rule, and love, and wrath, the vastness of whose everlasting and omnipresent personality transcends the united conception of all the minds which He has created, fills all eternity, and overflows all space.

Such is the theocracy which Scripture teaches us from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelations. Why is it, that we have deserted, rejected, denied, forgotten these truths ? Our Lord Himself has furnished us with the answer—*Ye cannot serve God and Mammon*.



This impossible achievement we have endeavoured to accomplish, these incompatible services we have attempted to fulfil; and the result has been that which was of old predicted—*We have held to the one and despised the other.*

“Commercial prosperity, manufacturing pursuits, scientific discoveries, luxury, wealth, and whatever tends to increase the several comforts and conveniences of ‘the life that now is,’ may and ought to have their due proportion of our regard. But at present they are pursued with idolatrous enthusiasm: religion, art, science, literature, taste,—all are touched by their low contagion: profit and loss are the two talismanic words which cause the social pulse of the empire to rise and fall; The Exchange is fast becoming our national temple, and the medium of market and money the only aspect through which we desire to interpret the true character of the nineteenth century!”—p. 170.

Wealth is the subject of our deepest studies, wealth the end of our most careful legislation, wealth the condition of political power, wealth the test of moral excellence, wealth the standard of social intercourse, wealth is the object of our constant endeavours, wealth is the God of our idolatry.

Political economy, a science good and useful in its proper place, has usurped the position of political philosophy; though to confound the two together is in reality an error analogous to that of identifying a mere druggist with an experienced physician.

Our politicians no longer believe that, in a temporal point of view, wealth is only desirable so far as it conduces to the enjoyment of mankind. They seek for prosperity not as the *handmaid*, but as the *substitute* for happiness. Any spiritual view by which wealth might be regarded as the bounty of God, entrusted to man for the honour of the OWNER and the good of HIS creatures, is universally ignored both by public men and private individuals. Does our Heavenly Father, or our Holy Mother require at our hands any portion of the goods that pertaineth to us?—The world is ready with some plausible excuse for our niggardly and undutiful selfishness—and suffers us not to do any thing for the honour of HIM who begat, or the service of Her who bare us. If a brother or a sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, theoretic philanthropy declares in the soft tones of fantastic sentimentalism: *Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled*;—but Mammon declines on philosophic grounds to *give them those things which are needful for the body*: or, if his sway be not yet undisputed in the heart, suffers them only *to be fed with the crumbs which fall from the rich man’s table.*

Does Scripture declare, in no equivocal terms, “*Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve?*”—

Mammon points to all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, and replies by the mouth of the political economist, "*All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.*"

Does one of Christ's poor demand from his richer brother that love which the Redeemer appointed as the distinctive mark of the redeemed, the sign by which His followers should be known, the test of their reality, and the pledge of their success? And does he strengthen his appeal for sympathy and kindness, by referring to the Apostle's words? *If ye fulfil the royal law of liberty, according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well: but if ye have respect of persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors.*—Mammon is near at hand to suggest the reply, *Stand by thyself! Come not near unto me, for I am WEALTHIER than thou!*

So prevalent, so all-pervading, so all-polluting is this Mammon Worship,—commenced in defiance of our Lord's warning, and carried out to the denial of His truth, the neglect of His law, the dishonour of His throne, the disgrace of His Church, the disbelief in His power, and the disregard of His word.

Once more, notwithstanding its minor faults of style and arrangement, we commend Mr. Montgomery's work to the study of an age which is pre-eminently in want of the instruction which it contains, which has well-nigh forgotten those theocratic principles so ably and eloquently advocated in the volume before us.

In conclusion, we would urge upon our contemporaries, whether as individuals or members of the community, to abandon the vain endeavour to serve God and Mammon, and devote all their energies to the service of GOD AND MAN.

---

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

- 
- .. A Physician's Holiday. By Rev. J. Forbes. 2. A Second Letter to Rev. W. Maskell. By Rev. M. W. Mayow. 3. The Church Apostolic, Primitive, and Anglican. By Rev. J. Collingwood. 4. Rev. C. Marriott's Sermons, Vol. II. 5. Rev. C. A. Heurtley's Parochial Sermons. 6. The Midnight Sun. 7. Rev. E. Cust's Family Reading. 8. Rev. J. A. Wickham's Synopsis of the Doctrine of Baptism, &c. 9. An Introduction to Conchology. By G. Johnston. 10. ΘΗΙΚΩΝ ΑΡΕΤΩΝ ΥΠΟΤΥΠΩΣΙΣ. A Selection from the Nichomachean Ethics of Aristotle. By Rev. W. Fitzgerald. 11. The Life, Letters, and Opinions of W. Roberts, Esq. By Rev. A. Roberts. 12. Hudleston's Sermons. 13. Fides Laici. 14. Monsell's Parish Musings in Verse. 15. Sir A. Edmonstone's Letter to the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway on Church Affairs. 16. Fortescue's Tudor Supremacy in Jurisdiction unlimited. 17. Homer's Iliad, Books I.—IV., with Critical Introduction, &c. By Rev. T. K. Arnold. 18. Rev. G. Crabbe's Posthumous Sermons. 19. St. George for England! 20. Mrs. Jamieson's Legends of the Monastic Orders. 21. Hostius's Paradise of the Christian Soul. 22. Alison's Essays, Vol. III. 23. Eastern Churches. By Author of "Proposals for Christian Union." 24. Regeneration. A Poem. By George Marsland. 25. Dr. O'Brien's Visitation Charge in 1848. 26. Rig-Veda-Sanhita. Translated from the original Sanskrit. By Rev. H. H. Wilson. 27. Neale's Letter to Archdeacon Hare on the Gorham Question. 28. Emperors of Rome. By Mrs. H. Gray. 29. The Poor Artist. 30. Record of the College of Christ Church, in Brecon. By Rev. J. Pratt. 31. An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome. Part II. By Rev. C. Smith. 32. Stretton's Compilation of Church Hymns. 33. Canterbury Papers. 34. Jones's Tracts on the Church. 35. Sickmess, its Trials and Blessings. 36. "One Lord, one Faith." 37. The Christian Gentleman's Daily Walk. By Sir A. Edmonstone. 38. Miller's Safe Path for Humble Churchmen. 39. A Brief Analysis of the Doctrine and Argument in the Gorham Case. By Lord Lindsay. 40. Tomlins' Sermons. 41. Sacra Privata. 42. The Changes of our Times. 43. The Child's Preacher. By the Hon. and Rev. L. Barrington.
- 

1.—*A Physician's Holiday; or, a Month in Switzerland in the Summer of 1848.* By JOHN FORBES, M.D., F.R.S., *Physician to Her Majesty's Household.* London: Murray.

DR. FORBES writes for a very large class of the English community; for the love of travelling is almost a distinctive national characteristic in Englishmen of the higher classes. It would seem as if some sense of oppression weighed them down, in contemplating the limits of their sea-girt dwelling, and that they were compelled, ever and anon, for relief, to seek for the liberty of roaming over the Continent. We scarcely know to what else to attribute the inveterate habit of "travelling," which has become second nature to so many Englishmen. We often meet men who seem to spend their whole life in locomotion, and have no sooner returned to England, but they are preparing for the road again. What swarms of travellers crowd our sea-ports in



August and September on the summer migration! Statesmen and schoolmasters—clergy and stockbrokers—students and soap-boilers—all make a simultaneous rush for the Continent; and a prodigious relief must the said Continent experience when the inundation has fairly drained off, and left them time to look about them, and to eat their dinners in quiet.

Physicians are like other men: they have bodily necessities and ailments themselves; and when the golden stream of which they have been drinking fails, usually about the breaking up of Parliament, they feel themselves at liberty to follow the example of the rest of the world, and migrate. Dr. Forbes gives us an insight into the doings of this class of the community amusingly enough:—

“They who are fortunate enough to possess country-houses of their own, go to them, and there indulge in farming, gardening, tree-felling, walk-making, or any other of the well-known rural contrivances for letting the brain lie fallow, and killing time in an easy way.

“Sporting doctors fix the day of their departure from town either on the 12th of August, the 1st of September, or the 1st of October, according as their love is, respectively, for grouse, partridge, or pheasant; and their destination is determined accordingly, to the hills of Scotland, to the northern moors, or to the stubble-fields nearer home. The salmon-fisher retires to the river-side inns of Wales or Scotland. The lover of trout, if he cannot make his holiday terminate early in September, must be content to postpone his amusement to the spring, unless he knows where the grayling haunt in the streams of Hampshire, Lancashire, or Yorkshire. The patient and philosophic men of the Punt, whose sport is ‘bottom-fishing,’ and whose delight is in roach, dace, perch, chub, barbel, gudgeon, or bream, betake themselves to the localities where their prey lurk, east, west, north, or south, wherever streams flow, or ponds stagnate. But woe to the doctor who only exchanges the chair in the study for the chair in the punt. His holidays will hardly be more profitable to his body, whatever they may be to his soul, than if he had taken them in Hyde Park or on Primrose Hill.

“Some physicians join their yachting friends in a trip to Jersey, Lisbon, Malta, or the Azores; some make a voyage in a trading ship to Hamburg or Drontheim; while others of this class, but of humbler aims, appease their thirst for water by making the periplus of our own islands in the common steamboats. A few revive the associations of their youthful days in quietly traversing some of the northern *links* from breakfast to dinner-time, in philosophical pursuit of the golf-ball.

“Others whose love of art is too potent to allow them to go quite beyond the sphere of patients, transport themselves to Brighton, Ramsgate, Matlock, or other places of water, maritime or inland, where they may take a fee now and then, as well as fresh air and a walk in the country, and may return to town at a moment’s warning, or once a

week at least, to see one or two very old friends, or two or three very urgent cases, and then go back to their oppidiorural retreat, in better spirits, and with renovated relish for both work and play. Some individuals of this class, of more vigorous frames or more active habits than their neighbours, have, since the epoch of railways, adopted a yet more efficacious method of combining the enjoyment of country air and country scenes with the ordinary labours of their vocation. They take a house near a railway station, ten, fifteen, or even twenty miles from town, possess themselves of a season-ticket for three months, and go backwards and forwards—to their work and their play—every morning and afternoon, except on Sunday, which they always allow to ‘shine complete holiday’ for them.

“Many busier juniors and less-endowed seniors must content themselves with doings of a humbler sort than this; such as a residence for a few weeks in some similar locality, whence their hospital or dispensary can be visited twice or thrice a week. Some must even be content with a hebdomadal trip by the express-train of Saturday afternoon, to visit their distant friends in the country, under solemn protest that they must return on Monday morning.

“A philosophical friend, whose active brain will not allow him to desert his books and his apparatus, even for the woods and fields which he loves so much, takes his holiday sometimes in quite a different style: he sends his horses to grass, shuts up his front-windows, retires to his library in the rear, and leaves strict injunctions with the footman to inform all inquirers, patients especially, that he has gone on his annual holiday. But he sins, and he knows it, worse than the punt-fisher.

“A travelling trip to Wales, to Scotland, or to the Continent, is one of the commonest forms of holiday-making for the London physician, and assuredly one of the best. This takes him thoroughly away from his business and books, changes every thing without and within him, climate, air, exercise, habits, studies, ideas; and generally, within the period of five or six weeks, works such a thorough revolution in soul and body, that he returns to his home a new man, sunburnt and buoyant and keener and defter in his vocation than ever.”

Dr. Forbes hopes to “allure” some of his professional brethren into continental travelling, by the publication of his adventures on the road. We must really remonstrate with the doctor on this course of proceeding. Can he doubt that almost every physician, surgeon, apothecary, and chemist, who can provide the necessary funds, is at this moment on the Continent, or as often as he *can*? We have no doubt on the subject; and then how cruelly tantalizing is it of the doctor to invite to forbidden pleasures those less fortunate members of the profession, whose circumstances oblige them to indulge in a suburban retreat for Sunday, and no more. Nay, the evil is not confined to *that* class either. Every Englishman who reads this book,

and is chained by business to his own home, will be driven half wild at the description which Dr. Forbes with so much gusto gives of the progress of his tour. When this worthy "sexagenarian" straps his knapsack on his back, and clutches his Alpine staff; or as he whirls along in the desperate career of the railroad, or on the more sober-minded "char," he should bestow some thought in commiseration on that portion of his countrymen who are pining to follow his example. We speak strongly on the point, because we have experienced sensations ourselves in perusing Dr. Forbes' truth-telling and life-like descriptions, which others will without doubt share in; and though we can endure the monotony of old England, we confess to a sort of vague and half-formed resolution to start for Dover, and tempt the horrors of the passage to Ostend. The doctor may depend upon it that his exhortations to "travel" fall on very inflammable materials, when he addresses himself to an English population. We should like to be the proprietors of Murray's Handbooks,—those indispensable accompaniments of the portmanteau and the knapsack; and Dr. Forbes' work will henceforth take its place regularly along with them in the hands of the tourist of the Rhine, and of Switzerland.

Dr. Forbes recommends the tour on *medical* grounds also. This is really too bad; but still we cannot refuse to state what the doctor alleges, as it may be of use to some of our readers, whose good health we sincerely desire:—

"A journey of this kind, properly conducted according to the circumstances of the particular case, will be still more beneficial to that numerous—I had almost said that innumerable—class of invalids who, although unaffected by any fatal or even dangerous disease, are yet so disordered and distressed by chronic functional derangements of various kinds, and by consequent debility, that their condition is much more to be pitied than that of the victims of the severest diseases of an acute kind. To these unhappy persons, whether their malady be, in popular or learned phrase, 'bile,' 'liver,' 'stomach,' 'dyspepsy,' 'indigestion,' 'mucous membrane,' 'suppressed gout,' 'dumb gout,' 'nerves,' 'nervousness,' 'hypochondriasis,' 'low spirits,' &c. &c., I will venture to recommend such a tour as that described in this little book—*mutatis mutandis*—as more effectual in restoring health than any course of medicines, taken under the most skilful supervision, *at home*. And, to say truth, such a journey may be made to fulfil almost every indication of cure applicable to such cases, which, however varied in appearance, are, in reality, extremely similar in their more essential characters.

"A Course of Travelling of this sort—to speak medically—carried out in the fine season, in one of the healthiest localities of Europe, in a pure and bracing air, under a bright sky, amid some of the most attractive and most impressive scenes in nature, in cheerful company, with a



mind freed from the toils and cares of business, or the equally oppressive pursuits, or rather no-pursuits of mere fashionable life,—will do all that the best medicines can do in such cases, and much that they never can accomplish.

“It is now well known to all experienced and scientific physicians, that chronic functional diseases of long standing, can only be thoroughly cured by such general and comprehensive means as act on the whole system, and for a certain period of time, influencing the nutrition in its source, not merely by the supply of wholesome elements, but by keeping the nutrient function active and vigorous over the entire fabric, by an equable distribution of blood and nervous influence, and consequent energetic action of all the secreting organs. When drugs are useful in such cases, they are so only as subsidiary means calculated to fulfil some special, local, or partial indication. It need therefore excite no surprise that a *COURSE OF TRAVELLING*, calculated as it is, or at least may be made, to fulfil all the foregoing requisites, should be held forth as one of the most important methods of curing many chronic diseases. But as I am not now addressing the sick, but the well, or at most those who, though classed as invalids, can, without hazard, comport themselves as healthy travellers, I shall, in the few remarks I am about to set down, make no reference as to what should be the proper proceedings of persons labouring under formal disease. They must consult their physicians. I address those only who have not and need not physicians.”

The dietary of the tourist is no unimportant item in the whole affair. The keen air of the mountain regions of Switzerland, and the length of way to which the pedestrian in that favoured land is tempted and enabled to extend his walks, creates a demand for food, which is in danger of becoming at times voracious, and thereby inflicting serious injury on the animal economy. To the dyspeptic and pill-taking, again, the change in the habits of life is one of much practical importance. The daily pill and the potion are inconvenient inside passengers in long pedestrian excursions; and yet how are they to be dispensed with? This difficult problem is solved by the medical sagacity of our author. He makes the following useful remarks on the subject:—

“As invalids and, among the rest, dyspeptic or bilious invalids constitute an important section in the list of those whom I have recommended to travel, it may be expected that I should have something special to say respecting *their* diet and general mode of living. This, however, is not the case; or if I would lay down any rules, they would all be comprised in the single word *MODERATION*—moderation in strong food, and still more in strong drink. So far from recommending rigid adherence to a precise and peculiar diet, I do not hesitate to say that one of the great advantages of travelling, in cases of this kind, is that it affords a most favourable opportunity for breaking through the tram-

mels of such a system. Nothing is so easy as to coddle and pamper the stomach into intolerance of all the more common kinds of food, by adherence to certain rigid formulæ of diet; and when this exclusiveness is once thoroughly established, it is hardly possible to break through it in the patient's usual sphere, although, while it exists, firm or stable health can never be attained. The institution of such a system of diet may be very proper in the first instance, in order to give relief to urgent symptoms, to correct still greater errors in the mode of living, or to give room for a rational system of cure; but when it is made a permanent regulation, and when it and its universal accompaniment, the daily pill and potion, are relied on as the exclusive means of health and strength, nothing can be more delusive or more injurious. Instead of enjoying real, vigorous, independent health, the votaries and victims of such a system can only be said to live a sort of negative, artificial life, as if by nature's sufferance, not her sanction—and, for a man's life, one surely both afflicting and degrading. Out of such a thralldom it is barely possible for an invalid to escape *at home*; but it is far from impracticable, if the case is not of very long standing, to do so abroad—that is, during an active tour.

“Almost the only way of breaking such a chain, is the way in which the analogous chains and circles of the magicians used to be broken—namely, by simply willing and daring to do so. What was felt to be impossible in London, and what, if attempted, would have really been unsuccessful in accustomed air and haunts, amid habitual occupation, or no-occupations, will be found perfectly practicable to a traveller amid the mountain valleys and breezy passes of Switzerland. The bracing air, the brilliant sky, the animating scenes, the society of cheerful and emulous companions, and, above all, the increased corporeal exercise, will soon produce such a fundamental alteration in mind and body, in spirits and stomach, that what would have been felt like poison, will be here not only harmless but wholesome. Therefore it is, that I advise invalid travellers—those at least of the bilious, dyspeptic, hypochondriac, pill-taking class,—to follow no special regimen, but to eat the food that others eat—with the sole provisoes, that they seek for and see the sights as others do, take all the exercise their strength will admit of, and remember the golden rule of *moderation* at all times, but more especially in the commencement of their emancipation.

“Those who have had opportunities of observing what coarse fare becomes perfectly digestible by the most pampered stomachs, under the rough treatment of the hydropathists, amid the bracing breezes of Graefenberg or Malvern, and with the accompaniments of cheerful society, encouraging promises, no wine, and plenty of walking, will not be much surprised at the recommendation just made; any more than the invalid patrons of the Alpenstock need be surprised to hear of the wonderful cures effected by the water-doctors. Both systems substitute action for inaction; the toil of muscle for the toil of brain; exposure for coddling; the roughness of the ruder times and humbler

classes for the luxuries and over-refinements of an advanced civilization; and the return to a natural condition of the system, that is, to Health, is the consequence."

"Sight-seeing" in Switzerland is not exactly the sort of thing that it is elsewhere. It possesses the dignity of "danger" for those who are willing to venture on the experiment. The following spirited description of the *Mer de Glace*, will recal to the reader's mind the sensations which he experienced in first looking down into its unfathomable chasms:—

"We had a fine view of the glacier below us, all the way as we advanced; and looking back along its course to the green valley beyond, it presented a striking appearance. Through the greater part of its descent, its surface exhibits a sort of ice-forest—a continuous series of sharp icy pinnacles, set close to one another, and many of them of considerable height. This is the form that glaciers in certain positions constantly assume, in the process of melting, and it is a very picturesque one. These pinnacles are also very beautiful when the sun shines bright upon them, exhibiting something of translucency and blueness in their finer points and angles. We saw something of this on the present occasion, as the weather remained clear and fine during the two hours which it took us to reach the *Mer de Glace*.

"We attained the object of our walk just above the point where the two mountain bases retreat backwards, and open out a wider space for the main body of the glacier to spread itself. On getting upon this we found our progress much more difficult and slow than I had anticipated; and we soon discovered that we had need of the aid and guidance of both our attendants. Although we had here none of the pinnacles which mark the glacier lower down, we had a good deal of the kind of surface which forms the base on which they stand, namely, a constant succession of round hummocks or narrow ridges of ice, with sides more or less steep and slippery, and separated from one another by pretty deep hollows or huge ruts, twisting about in all directions, with deep wells and chasms of every shape and size, some with water, some without, traversing and obstructing the path on every side. But for the aid of our Alpenstocks to steady our footing on the slippery slopes and narrow ridges, and to enable us to leap across the cracks and hollows, we could have hardly advanced at all; and without the personal assistance of our guides, in the more difficult spots, even our Alpenstocks would have occasionally proved insufficient. Not that there were any extreme difficulties or imminent dangers encountered or overcome by us, nor even any obstacles sufficiently formidable to hinder a man of ordinary resolution from encountering them by himself; I mean simply to state, without exaggeration, that the route was not merely troublesome but difficult, and such as should, on no account, be attempted by a stranger, however active, without an experienced guide.

"The first part of our course lay nearly across the glacier; and



about its middle we encountered the grand chasm or crevasse which constitutes the channel of its main glacier-stream (Gletscherstrom). This channel was in some places open at top for a considerable space, at other times it was vaulted over and quite concealed by the solid ice. Where open, it twisted about through the mass of the glacier, exactly like the channel of the Rhine in the rocks of the Via Mala, or of the Tamina at Pfeffers, or the Weissenbach seen by us the day before. It resembled them also very remarkably in its size, depth, and configuration—being quite narrow, and the sides occasionally overlapping one another, so as to hide the stream from view, though its channel was quite open at top. When exposed, the stream, of considerable size, was seen at a great depth, rushing along its bed of ice with a tremendous noise and at an amazing rate, and shooting in beneath that portion of the mass which was yet unbroken. In no place, that we saw, had the stream sawn the ice quite through so as to have the solid earth or rock for its bed, which appears to me rather singular, considering the effect of such streams in cutting asunder the solid rock itself; an effect, by the way, which is admirably explained and illustrated by the phenomena of these rivers in the ice. Where the chasms were the deepest, our guides favoured us with the usual exhibition of tumbling huge masses of stone into them, in order that we might see them darting from side to side in their descent, and hear the prolonged echoes they occasioned. Even on the middle of the glacier there was no difficulty of meeting with plenty of materials for such an experiment, as the whole of its surface was strewn with large stones and fragments of rock, fallen from the mountains far beyond us on either hand, and now in progress towards its sides or end to supply fresh matter to the moraine.

“It was into this main channel that M. Monson, a Lutheran clergyman of Iverdun, fell, and was of course killed, in the year 1821. Our guides pointed out the very spot where he fell. It appears that the way in which this gentleman lost his life was this: fixing the point of his Alpenstock on the opposite side of the chasm to that where he was standing, he leant forwards upon it in order that he might obtain a better view of the chasm. While in this position the point of his staff slid from its hold, and he was of course precipitated into the gulf head foremost. After twelve days, the body was recovered by a guide and a friend of the deceased, who were let down by means of ropes to a depth of 130 feet. Owing to the conservative influence of the cold, the body, though broken and bruised, was found quite *fresh* when brought to the surface.

“An accident of a somewhat similar kind which once took place lower down on this glacier, had a more fortunate issue. An innkeeper of Grindelwald, of the name of Bohren, fell into a fissure upwards of sixty feet in depth; but though his arm was broken in the fall, he contrived to make his escape, by crawling along the downward course of the subglacial river, until it reached the open air. Luckily, the distance was not more than threescore feet.”

The following description of an avalanche is very well executed :—

“We were all suddenly roused and startled by a tremendous noise behind us, like a continuous peal of distant thunder, which made us instantly stop; and while we were in the act of turning round, our guides, shouting ‘An avalanche!’ pointed to the mountain behind us. We looked, and from beneath the lower border of the mist which covered it, and out of which the hoarse loud roar which still continued evidently came, we saw a vast and tumultuous mass of snow rushing down and shooting over the edge of the sheer cliff into the air beyond. At first this had a pointed triangular or conical shape, with the small end foremost; but as the fall continued, it assumed the appearance of a cascade of equal width throughout. In this form it continued until its upper extremity had parted from the cliff, and the whole mass had fallen to the earth; renewing, as its parts successively reached the ground, and with still louder and sharper reports, the sound which had momentarily ceased while it was falling through the air. The whole of the process, which has taken so long to describe, was the work of a few seconds, half a minute at most; and all was over and gone, and every thing silent and motionless as before, ere we could recover from our almost breathless wonder and delight. The excitement was then great; every one, as if suddenly freed from a spell suddenly cast upon him, talking, and exclaiming, and expressing his agitation in his own particular manner. What we had just witnessed—what we had seen, and heard, and almost felt—was, in relation to our perceptions, not a mere passive phenomenon, but *a work*, an active operation or performance, begun and ended in our presence; and it affected the mind as if it were really a result of voluntary power, an action in which the beholder could feel a sort of reflected sympathy, and take a personal interest. Hence the agitation and excitement, so different from the tranquil, solemn, and almost melancholy feelings with which we had just before been contemplating the ‘motionless torrent’ of the glacier, and the unveiling of the silent Schreckhorn.

“The avalanche seemed to us to come down exactly in the line of our upward path on first crossing the glacier; and we had, therefore, mingled with our other emotions, a sense of danger narrowly and happily escaped. On examining the spot more closely, however, on our return, we found that the nearest part of our former path was probably half a furlong or more from the spot where the avalanche fell; and I believe we should have sustained no damage had it taken place when our position was the nearest to it. Our guides, however, thought otherwise, and persisted in maintaining, that if we had been there, or even on our path on the cliff at the opposite side of the glacier, we should have been destroyed by what they call the *dust* and *wind* of the avalanche. I was utterly sceptical on this point at the time; and, much to the horror of the guides, could not help expressing my regret that it had not descended when we were close to it. I still think my opinion

correct ; but I own that it was somewhat shaken by what I afterwards learnt of the effects of an avalanche which fell from the Weisshorn in the year 1821, and which I shall have occasion to notice in a subsequent part of our journey.

“ The avalanche which we had witnessed was admitted by our guides to be of extraordinary size to fall so late in the year ; and the old goat-herd whose chalet we were approaching when it occurred, said that it was absolutely the largest that had fallen from the mountain during the last twelve years. Our good fortune in witnessing it was therefore doubly great. On viewing, from the opposite side of the gorge, on our way home, the mass of fresh snow which had fallen, we calculated its longitudinal extent to be more than a furlong ; and its depth may be guessed by the fact that it filled up the whole angle between the base of the precipice and the ridge of the glacier adjoining, whose crevices it completely obliterated to some distance from its border, covering it with a uniform sheet of snow. The impetus with which so great a mass must have fallen from such a height, would necessarily occasion a great compression and commotion of the air ; but whether it would have been sufficient to operate at the distance believed by our guides, is still to me very doubtful ; it is certain that, where we stood when it fell, no movement whatever, perceptible by the touch, was sustained by the air.”—pp. 157—159.

The following remarks on the recent ecclesiastical reforms and regulations in Piedmont are interesting :—

“ The two great practical boons the common people seemed best to understand and most to prize were, the relief from clerical oppression and taxation, and the liberty of the press. If I may trust to the fidelity and accuracy of my informants—and I obtained like statements from various quarters—it was indeed high time that the rule of the priests should receive a check in Piedmont : as it seems to have gone beyond all bounds of decency and moderation. The clerical fees seem to have been truly enormous, when the poverty of the people and the high value of money in that country are considered. I was assured that under the old regime, no less a sum than sixty francs had to be paid on the occurrence of a death in any family possessing the means to pay it, and this over and above the ordinary expenses for the coffin, &c. Out of the sixty francs some portion, as from five to eight francs, might go to cover a positive or ostensible outlay by the church, as for candles, mortcloth, &c., but all the rest went into the pocket of the priest of the commune. Sums proportionally great were paid for other offices of the church, as five francs for christening and twenty for marriage. These fines, to be sure, were the main source of the incomes of the clergy ; but whether the resulting sums-total to the individual priests were little or much, it is self-evident that they were an intolerable burthen to the people. By the new constitution, the priests are to be paid directly by the state, out of the general taxes ; and it is not doubted that their incomes will be much less than before.



"The general ecclesiastical rule, also, seemed to be of like arbitrary severity. Indeed, until the recent change, the priests appear to have here preserved all the power and authority of the old times. One of my informants, at Cormayeur, an apparently mild and moderate man, and with all the signs of an honest man in his behaviour, assured me that one instance occurred within his own knowledge, where a man underwent nine months' imprisonment, by the award of the bishop on the representation of the parish priest, for the sole crime of contumacy in refusing to attend confession.

"But all this abuse of power, and indeed almost all power whatever, of the clergy, is now at an end; and there is too much reason to fear that, for a time at least, religion itself will suffer in the correction of the misdoings of its ministers; it is certain that some of the dogmas and practices of the Roman Catholic church will from henceforth lose their influence and respect. I myself had sufficient proof of this. Many of the men of the lower ranks spoke with ridicule of confession, and still more of the power of the priest to forgive sins; the women, however, were still unshaken in their faith. Every one with whom I conversed seemed to be of opinion that the priests to a man desire the permanence of the old tyranny in the state as well as church, and, with this view, do all they can to prevent the instruction of the people. The Scriptures in their complete state are not forbidden in Piedmont, but they are not readily procurable, partly from their high price, and partly from want of facility of purchase: abridgments alone are in common use."

We must now take our leave of Dr. Forbes and his work. We have seldom perused a more interesting Tour, and we commend it with confidence to all who are about to visit the regions which he has so well described.

II.—*A Second Letter to the Rev. W. Maskell, M.A. By the Rev. MAYOW WYNELL MAYOW, M.A., Vicar of Market Lavington, Rural Dean, &c.* London: Pickering.

It is a great satisfaction to find, that when men like Mr. Maskell assail the Church, they are not left without an answer. It was our impression on reading Mr. Maskell's first letter that his connexion with the English Church was virtually at an end. It was a kind of step from which a man cannot recede without indelible disgrace. Several of his previous publications had exhibited so strong a leaning towards Romanism, that the course he finally adopted ought not, we think, to have excited any surprise. The same may be said of Mr. Allies indeed; and it is not to be denied that there are others who may be expected to follow their examples. The truth is, the only cause for wonder is, that there have not been *more* secessions; for the influence

exercised over some members of the Church by others of note, who seceded from us some time since, was so great, that it seemed very surprising that they had not yielded at once to the example of their friends. We had hoped that this Romanizing influence had died out; but recent events prove plainly that it is still in existence; and it is a very noxious influence. We have not the slightest doubt, however, that the genuine Church feeling of the great mass of Churchmen will take such shapes as will soon detach it from any influence of the kind, and permit those who are inclined to Rome, to take their own course of proceeding. Mr. Mayow's pamphlet was written, in a great degree, before Mr. Maskell's secession, a fact which he notices in his Preface as explanatory of some part of his work. Its tone is that of a friend remonstrating with a friend, and while opposed to his views, yet doing justice to his motives and intentions. The earlier part of this pamphlet discusses various statements of Mr. Maskell's with reference to the assumed ambiguity of the doctrines of the Church of England, and the want of dogmatic teaching. After this Mr. Mayow discusses the judgment of the Privy Council, and proves its impropriety on various grounds. We extract the following passages, containing matter of great importance:—

“In the first place then, we find the following declaration of the judges, presenting their own view of their powers. ‘The Court,’ they tell us, ‘has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith:’ that is, they give us to understand it was by no means its province, and as little its desire, to invade the precincts of the Church's sanctuary, and ‘determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England.’ Of course, the latter part of this sentence is true. Their duty was to declare, (so far as any jurisdiction they had might enable them to declare,) not what *ought* to be, but what *was* the doctrine of the English Church. If they only meant therefore to say, it was not their business or their wish to enact any new canon on baptism, one is almost tempted to smile at their simplicity in thinking it necessary so solemnly to enunciate such a truism, or thus to magnify themselves upon such moderation and forbearance; but if they thought or meant to disclaim settling any thing concerning doctrine by the powers of interpretation, which they could not avoid exercising, one is tempted again to smile, only more bitterly, to think of any persons, and especially judges in so solemn a cause, entertaining so chimerical a notion as this disclaimer evinces. What! did they imagine they could escape ‘settling doctrine’ by the judgment they gave, merely by leaving every man to teach what he pleased? Did they forget that interpretation itself is a power that settles what it interprets? Did they suppose a translator assigns no sense to the book which he translates? Did they, or could they, for a single moment lose sight of the fact, that

they *must* 'settle' whether Mr. Gorham were to be instituted to the living of Brampford-Speke or not : and in so doing must determine that 'the doctrine held by him' was, or 'was not, contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England?' One can hardly believe they could lose sight of or misunderstand such a point, and therefore we seem driven rather to let them take refuge in the truism, than chase them into the paradox, however the latter may be the more natural suggestion of their words. But even so, it must, I think, be allowed, that the diction of what ought to have been a most carefully considered document is very clumsily obscure ; as is evident from the number of persons since its publication who keep continually quoting upon us those words of the judgment, and assuring us that by the showing and declaration of the Committee of Privy Council itself, 'doctrine is not affected.' And this obscurity is darkened even more by the aid of the published comment upon, or perhaps I should say reiteration of, the same view, given since by an eminent member of the court. Lord Campbell, in one of his letters to Miss Sellon, says, 'I assure you we have given no opinion contrary to your's upon the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. *We had no jurisdiction to decide any doctrinal question*, and we studiously abstained from doing so. We were *only called upon to construe the articles and formularies of the Church, (!)* and to say whether they be so framed as to condemn certain opinions expressed by Mr. Gorham.' If Lord Campbell individually, or the judges generally, mean merely that their own personal faith being in agreement or disagreement with Mr. Gorham's opinions, is not a point decided by their sentence, I most entirely allow this ; but if they mean, as certainly a large portion of the world has understood them to mean, that to admit Mr. Gorham to a benefice with cure of souls, and to say the doctrine held and published by him is 'not contrary or repugnant to the declared doctrine of the Church of England,' does not 'settle doctrine,' so far as that Church's teaching is concerned, (and so far as they have authority,) this certainly strikes me as a most marvellous inaccuracy, bespeaking any thing rather than ability or judicial clearness. Yet if they did not mean this, (though to speak of a matter of personal faith might be in point, as far merely as regarded Lord Campbell's clearing himself with Miss Sellon,) how should their judgment tend, as they seem to have hoped it would, to peace :—'to heal,' as Lord Campbell expresses it, 'the wounds from which the Church of England has lately suffered?' 'What hast thou to do with peace,' surely we may demand of the judgment itself, unless something real is to be made of this profession of not settling doctrine ? By such a mode of writing, the judges appear to have thought peace could be preserved ; nothing being settled, but the latitude of interpretation which might, as they supposed, include all, and let every man do 'that which was right in his own eyes :—a scheme that might possibly have answered if the points in question had been mere matters of human opinion, or if there had been none in the Church who believed them to be God's truth, which they had no right to give away : none also who



were sharp-sighted enough to see that to make any doctrine an open question, is to rule that there is no dogmatic teaching upon it at all. Not to have observed these things more distinctly, and not more distinctly to have expressed themselves as to what they really thought their office was, appears to me, in the very outset, to be *not* indicative of ability or acuteness in the Court."

After fully discussing the authority of the judgment of the Privy Council's judgment, Mr. Mayow proceeds to the question of the dogmatic teaching of the English Church; and he proves from Mr. Maskell's own statements, and also from the principles of the Church of England, that there is a body of dogmatic teaching in the Church.

"Let me ask you to examine with attention the evidence I am about to adduce. I would arrange it under the following heads:—

"I. Common sense, and the nature of things.

"II. Appeals of our Church to antiquity, and the teaching of the Church universal, as well as to her own previous constitutions and canons.

"III. Recognition of such previous teaching by the civil power; if not proving the same point positively, yet at least showing negatively that it is not contradicted.

"IV. Some confirmation of the above view from considerations of what the Church of England would deprive herself of, (which no one has ever supposed her to have done,) if the principle were to be carried out that her existence is to be dated from the sixteenth century only; and nothing to belong to her rule of faith but what was then determined, and in words set down.

"I. Surely it is most certain, on grounds of abstract reason and common sense, that things will stand as they are, if they neither fall to decay of themselves, nor are altered by any external power. No one pretends that the dogmatic teaching of a Church will fall to decay of itself. The other alternative, therefore, is all we have here to consider. I say, then, that of any building, what you do not destroy remains. You find such or such a fabric standing. It is, in your opinion, out of repair, or deformed with unnatural or unsightly excrescences, which in process of time have overgrown, or been engrafted upon it. Additions you may conceive them to be to the original structure, and now, injurious or inconvenient. You resolve that these, whether accidental or evilly contrived, shall be removed, and you address yourself to the task.

"But further, we are not without an abundance of external proof, if I may so call it, besides this common-sense reasoning, showing that the Church of England at the reformation, if we gather her intentions not from opinions of individual reformers, but from her own authoritative acts, did not mean to adopt a wide and indiscriminate destruction of her previous teaching, and did mean to keep all that she did not mark to be destroyed. This point was the foundation of a large part of the

most learned and able argument of Mr. Badeley before the Committee of Privy Council, by which he asserted, and as it seems to me, proved (although the Court appears to have taken absolutely no notice at all of this part of his speech) the certain and positive connexion of the Church of England with the previous Church in this country, and with the Church universal, and this, not only by the links of the same apostolical succession, but in the maintenance of a connected doctrine. And the general principle as to antiquity, and the sense of the Church precedent to the reformation, which Mr. Badeley laid down expressly with a view to the matter of the suit in which he was engaged, and in order to apply it immediately to baptism; that same principle, be it observed, is applicable in exactly the same way, and the same fulness to every other article of the faith, unless any where it can be shown that the Church of England at the reformation did 'plainly, openly, and dogmatically contradict it.' It would therefore be very much to my present purpose to cite here nearly the whole of this part of Mr. Badeley's speech, but as you know it well, and can easily refer to it, I shall but extract a few of the more important passages, where the proofs of this principle being the rule of the English Church are given.

" 'I shall next appeal,' Mr. Badeley says, 'to antiquity in order to show more fully that this doctrine for which I contend,' (of course the immediate doctrine which Mr. Badeley had in view, was baptismal regeneration: but his argument reaches, as I have just said, to the full purpose for which I cite it;) 'has always been, and must necessarily still be, the doctrine of the Church of England. . . . If there can be any doubt at all about the sense and meaning of our Church, if it can be supposed by any criticism or minute construction, that these articles and formularies do leave any question open—do omit in any degree to declare with certainty the doctrine of the Church, resort must be had not to the writings of the reformers, not to the opinions of any individuals, however respectable they may have been; the only appeal can be to the early Church, and the doctrines which that Church professed. That is indisputably the standard to which we are referred, not only by our Prayer Book and our Homilies, but by those who took the most prominent part in the reformation in this country, and it is natural that this should be so, because what was in fact the reformation, and what its object? My friend, Mr. Turner, the other day, spoke of the Church of England in 1552, as being then in its infancy: but according to my understanding, it was then at least more than 1200 years old, for we have evidence of British Bishops having attended some of the earliest councils. Some are supposed to have been present at the Council of Nicæa, and it is positively stated that three attended the Council of Arles, which was prior to that of Nicæa. The Church of England, therefore, is an ancient and an apostolic Church, deriving its succession from the primitive Church, and one and the same through all ages. The reformation was no *new formation*, not a creation of a *new Church*, but the correction and restoration of an old one; it professed only to repair and reform, not to found or create—and it

assumed to do this, according to the doctrine and usages of the primitive Church. The reformers well knew, that if they did not stand upon that ground, they had no resting-place for the soles of their feet; they were fully conscious that if they attempted to alter the Church any otherwise than according to its ancient model, it would crumble to pieces altogether, and probably bury them in its ruins. All they professed was, to strengthen it where it was decayed, and to strip off those additions which have encrusted or grown upon it in the lapse of time, without the authority of the Scripture, or of primitive tradition; but to this they declared that they adhered; they bound themselves down by this rule, and appealed to antiquity for all they did.'

"Then having quoted a passage from 'Bishop Jewell's Apology,' appealing to antiquity as our Church's guide, and showing (to use Mr. Badeley's words) 'that the intention of our reformers in departing from the Church of Rome, was not at all to depart from the doctrine of the Catholic Church,' he goes on to cite confirmatory authority to the same point in even more weighty documents.

"'In the preface to the Prayer Book, as well as in the Articles, we have frequent references to the Fathers and the primitive Church. We have the same in the Homilies; in almost every page they teem with quotations from the Fathers, and support themselves upon the ancient doctrine and the Catholic tradition; and therefore, in inquiring into what was the doctrine of the early Church upon the question now in issue, we are following precisely that course of inquiry, and appealing to that tribunal, which was marked out for us by the reformers themselves. They referred to the primitive doctrine as an indication of their meaning; and of course, if they had departed from that, they would have departed from the Church itself, because the Church, and the faith of the Church, can be but one.' . . .

"'I can show, that at the time of the Reformation there certainly was no intention to depart, and was no real departure in any respect from the doctrine of the early Church, on this or any other matter, certainly not on the Sacrament of Baptism, or upon the Sacraments generally; AND WHATEVER WAS NOT ALTERED AT THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION, REMAINS, AND CONTINUES TO BE THE DOCTRINE AND LAW OF THE CHURCH TO THIS DAY.'"

The latter part of Mr. Mayow's pamphlet expresses sentiments with reference to the course which might, under certain contingencies, be the duty of Churchmen. He points out the possibility, in case of any attempt to enforce heretical teaching in the English Church, that a great secession may take place to Rome, or a free Church be established. We do not quite like the notion of dread of a secession to *Rome* on a large scale being contemplated, as an inducement to adopt any particular course; or, indeed, secession of any kind; and, indeed, we have no doubt, that Mr. Mayow would be the last person to recommend any such course. He contemplates, as every one must do, the



*possibility* of the Church being a different body from the establishment. It may not be always in the power of Churchmen to remain in possession of the endowments of the Church, because the State may expel them by law, or their opponents may gain the ascendancy, and deprive them of their temporalities; but their spiritualities they may retain notwithstanding, and in retaining them, they would constitute the Church of England without any secession. We say this merely on the supposition of extreme cases, which, we trust, are not likely to be realized. For instance, were the plan of refusing communion formally to the Archbishop of Canterbury universally carried out, an Act of Parliament might be passed compelling such communion, and then men might be deprived in numbers of their benefices. We should not think it advisable to bring matters to such a crisis at present, or to any crisis of the kind, inasmuch as we think more evil than good would result to the cause of truth, in the present state of the public mind: therefore we should think it unadvisable to provoke any crisis; though Churchmen must always henceforward be ready for it, if it is forced upon them. We have been greatly interested by the perusal of this able and courageous publication.

III.—*The Church Apostolic, Primitive, and Anglican. A Series of Sermons. By the Rev. JOHN COLLINGWOOD, M.A., Minister of Duke-street Episcopal Chapel, Westminster: one of the Masters of Christ's Hospital, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

WE have perused much of this volume with sincere gratification at its healthy tone of Churchmanship. Mr. Collingwood is a faithful and an able advocate of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from Romanism on the one hand, and from dissent and latitudinarianism on the other. In his preface, Mr. Collingwood notices the objection which some may advance to his work as being too decidedly anti-Roman, and as coming under the imputation of "throwing stones" unnecessarily. He observes in reply, that while composing the work, he had been excited to indignation by the arrogant and insolent denunciation of the English Church by Dr. Wiseman, in a Lent pastoral. "But," he continues,

"To throw aside the plea of special provocation, surely there is very much higher ground to be taken on this subject. Is it not a fact that from an amiable but mistaken feeling, the *suppressio veri*, with regard to Rome, has been too long tried? Is it not a fact that a delusive notion of *charity*, a desire of 'winning by gentle love,' have had too much weight with many, who are yet amongst the staunchest and

soundest ministers of the English Church? Is it not true, not that our CATHOLICISM has been brought too prominently forward, for that can never be, but that our PROTESTANTISM has been too much kept in the back ground? And what has been the result? Let the 'Lenten Indult' and the 'Final Appeal' of Dr. Wiseman,—let the perversions to Rome, which ever and anon shows us too plainly that men holding 'all Roman doctrine,' alas, that it should be again said! have long been ministering at England's altars,—supply an answer to this question."

The fact is, that the reconciliation of the Church of England and that of Rome under existing circumstances, may be compared to that system of free-trade which has been so well described as "reciprocity all on one side." *We* are to give up every thing, and Rome is to give up nothing. That is the "plain English" of the transaction. We agree with Mr. Collingwood in recalcitrating most stubbornly against such a bargain. Our view of the question is rather different. We think the English Church might safely permit to the Church of Rome the use of the tonsure, of unleavened bread, and of lights on the altar, if Rome would undertake, on her part, to give up the Papal supremacy, transubstantiation, purgatory, and the worship of saints and images; but until she has done this, we would not move a step towards her. To do so only exposes ourselves to insult.

Mr. Collingwood first considers the Church, as a visible society, then proceeds to its government, including a discussion on the value of primitive testimony. The subjects of Christian unity, primitive Christianity, the Church of England before the Reformation, the Supremacy of St. Peter, the causes of the Reformation, the English Reformation, with its principles and results, the Supremacy of the Crown, and the responsibilities of Churchmen, form the chief topics of discussion: and in all we have perused of the volume, we have found sound principle and good sense. With reference to the supreme Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical cases, Mr. Collingwood—and in our opinion justly—observes that the chief grievance is, that the members of this Court need not even be Christians. On the Royal Supremacy he has the following judicious remarks:—

"It is important also to remind you, that while on the one hand the English Churchman is bound to pay, and is ever ready to pay, all dutiful obedience to the sovereign of this country; still, on the other hand, the circumstances bearing on the relations between the Crown and the Church, or rather, we should say, between the State and the Church, have so materially altered since the Reformation, that it is necessary to watch very narrowly the course of events at the present day, to take

care that the alliance between Church and State does not degenerate on the one part, into unworthy submission; does not grow, on the other, into an unjust usurpation. At the time the royal supremacy was more distinctly than before asserted in the canons and formularies of the Church, the sovereign of this country was the only ruling power in it; and moreover, the Church herself was able to speak, in her own name, and on her own behalf, through her own representative body, the convocation of this realm. Whereas now, the power formerly inherent in the Crown, is in a great measure vested, by the constitution of this country, in the Legislature; and that, too, a Legislature composed not simply of Churchmen, but not even necessarily of Christians; while the representative voice of the Church is altogether silenced by her convocation not being allowed to assemble to deliberate on spiritual matters."

We beg to tender Mr. Collingwood our thanks for the gratification we have derived from the perusal of his excellent and able work. Such men as this can do good service to the Church.

IV. — *Sermons preached in Bradfield Church, Berks, Oriol College Chapel, and other Places. By the Rev. C. MARRIOTT, B.D., &c. Vol. II. Littlemore: Mason. London and Oxford: Parker. 1850.*

THESE are very beautiful sermons, and well suited for private devotion or family reading. There is a depth of thought and simplicity of heart about them which quite charms us. The volume is not however free from oversights. In the sermon "*Vengeance is for God*," we find the following:—

"And observe, that this is more especially the case in the Gospel. For although there were saints under the law who forbore to avenge themselves,—as David, when he might have slain Saul,—yet it was then said, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth.' And our blessed Lord expressly changed this law."

The mistake here is twofold. In the first place, David spared Saul not as an act of mercy, but because he refused to lift his hand against the LORD'S anointed. In the second place, the *lex talionis*, established by Moses, promulgated a penalty to be enforced by the magistrate, not by private vengeance; though the Jews wrested the enactment so as to make it a justification of vindictiveness.

The twenty-first sermon has been written much too hastily; it should be written over again, and the last paragraph of the thirtieth sermon requires revision.

We cannot leave this book without giving one or two extracts. The following on Baptismal Regeneration is very good:—



"... When a soul is dedicated to God in Holy Baptism, either with its own good will, or in the passive state of infancy, through the 'charitable works' of others, He takes that soul to Himself, and remits the penalty of Adam's sin, which denies the Heavenly gift of His Presence to man till ransomed by the Blood of Christ. And coming to dwell in that soul, He begins to work in it after His own manner, mightily, though invisibly, and though not so as to control and overpower the human will. He is ready to aid the first efforts of good will, to enlighten the first dawn of spiritual understanding, to give a meaning to those truths which the natural man cannot see, 'because they are spiritually discerned;' and as the inward man advances in growth, He is ready to aid the efforts of the enlightened soul to mould itself anew to the perfect likeness of its Creator, and to perform all its actions according to His holy will. Who shall venture, indeed, to say, that He may not implant in the unconscious infant the germs of graces that shall hereafter expand into glories, any more than we can venture to deny that the child that knows not its right hand from its left, ay, even the child unborn, has in it the first elements of a future character?"—pp. 22, 23.

The following passage strikes us as very beautiful:—

"It is grievous to think of; but so it is, that there are many people who wonder what is the use of having these things always sounded in their ears. What is the use of hearing every day of the same things, when we know them? What is the use of saying the same prayers again and again, when we perhaps know them by heart, and when God knows what we want before we ask Him? Asking such questions shows that people do not love God as His little children ought to do. We know that 'as a father pitieth his own children, even so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him.' Now a father is not tired of hearing his little child say the same words from day to day; nay, he is not tired his infant cannot yet speak, but only utter sounds which a parent's love only can understand. The babe in arms can show by such sounds, repeated again and again, that he knows and loves his father and mother: he loves to cry to them, though he cannot say any thing but show that he loves them, and is glad to be with them; and they love to hear his voice, and see him stretch out his hands. No one asks why. It is because God has made them so. And He made us to be born of earthly parents, that we might have something like His own love to remember and think of all our lives: He loves to hear us cry to Him; He loves to see us lift up our hands in prayer to Him; He loves to see us fix our eyes upon Him, by attending to all that is made known to us about Him, not only that we may know more, but that we may think of what we know."—pp. 204, 205.

The sermon on the Pharisee and the Publican is very striking—take, for example, the following:—

"He [the Pharisee] was not a Dives who fared sumptuously every

day, nor one of those who made the temple a 'den of thieves' with their traffic, instead of a 'house of prayer;' nor was he one of those 'who devour widows' houses, and for a pretence make long prayers.' He went up into the temple really to pray. And in so doing he puts all those to shame, and leaves them behind, who go to church only for fashion's sake, and to be seen of men, and thought respectable; so far, his worship is better than theirs."—p. 325.

We would also point out the five last sermons as full of beauty and excellence.

v.—*Parochial Sermons, preached in a Village Church. Second Series. By the Rev. CHARLES A. HEURTLEY, B.D., &c.* Oxford and London: John Henry Parker. 1850.

THESE are excellent discourses, sound, manly, argumentative, and persuasive, with that clearness, both of conception and execution, which so strikingly characterize their author. It is really refreshing to see so much doctrinal orthodoxy, so much practical sense, and so much earnest piety combined together. We heartily recommend them to all those who wish either to *read* or to *preach* the sermons of others. There is a healthfulness about the volume which is quite invigorating.

vi.—*The Midnight Sun: a Pilgrimage. By FREDERICA BREMER, &c. Translated by MARY HOWETT.* One Vol. London: Colburn. 1849.

THE introduction, consisting of twenty-five pages of rubbish, we advise our readers to skip, and proceed at once to the story, which is one well worth the reading. The characters are graphically drawn, and all of them pleasing: the tale is pretty, the plot well managed, and the *denouement* striking; in fact, this is one of the most successful of Miss Bremer's shorter works; and though here and there there are little bits of nonsense, sentimental or transcendental, as the case may be, the general tone, tenor, and tendency of the volume is Christian in the fullest extent, and cannot fail, we should think, to do good to any one who enters into it.

vii.—*Family Reading. The New Testament Narrative Harmonized and Explained by the Bishops and Doctors of the Anglican Church. Compiled from Various Authors. By the Hon. SIR EDWARD CUST.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS work is intended for family reading, and will, we have no doubt, be an acceptable gift to the higher classes of society. Its

price will restrict its use to those classes, which is to be regretted, for we should think it would be comprehensible to the middling classes; and its practical and uncontroversial tone renders it both pleasing and profitable. The author lays claim to little of the matter as original, having collected his materials from our eminent bishops and divines.

“The custom of family reading,” says the author, “has become so universal, that an explanation of Scripture from the highest authorities appears to be still a desideratum for ordinary use; for, although our Biblical literature is rich in this branch of learning, there is still a deficiency of works popular enough for that object. I have endeavoured to avoid all polemical or doctrinal disquisitions, so that I do not apprehend that any reader need fear lest his prejudices should be shocked by the perusal of my work, if his object be only an unaffected sincere desire to understand the New Testament. At the same time I would not mislead him by showing any false colours. I am not solicitous to dilute the ‘sincere milk of the word’ to suit the religious palates of others. I write without any disguise as an episcopalian, and for the Church of my affections—the Church of England, alike removed from either extreme.”

The above may afford some notice of the plain and unaffected style of the volume.

VIII.—*A Synopsis of the Doctrine of Baptism, Regeneration, Conversion, &c., and kindred subjects, by the Fathers and other Writers, from the time of Our Saviour to the end of the Fourth Century. By J. A. WICKHAM, Esq., of Frome, Somerset. With a Preface by the Rev. D. WICKHAM, M.A., late of Exeter College, Oxford.* London: Bell.

THE work, of which the volume before us forms a portion, was the result of sixteen years of literary research bestowed by its author on the examination of the opinions held in different ages on the subject of Baptism. The object of the writer, in the portion now given to the public, is to examine every vestige of the writings of Christian antiquity, and to extract all passages bearing on the subject of Baptism. The following passage from the preface by the editor, will speak for itself:—

“The investigation of the solemn truth so positively enunciated, that ‘except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,’ was congenial to one who longed to be re-united to a spirit which he believed already a tenant of that better land. A small but well-selected library of old divines, inherited from clerical ancestors, among whom Squire and Stillingfleet might be mentioned, had long before acquainted my father



with the various opinions which theologians entertained on the words of our Lord to Nicodemus, and on the efficacy of baptism generally ; and, without anticipating the labour he was about to impose on himself, he commenced with the books of divinity he possessed, to collect the opinions of many authors on this question. Feeling increased interest in the subject, and deriving great mental benefit from it, he soon had to look for authorities beyond those in his own possession. The extensive collection of divinity to be found in Mr. Darling's Circulating Library, and the shelves of the British Museum, were now explored, and many other available sources resorted to, in order to obtain a view which might claim catholicity. Thus sixteen years had passed away on the same undeviating and uninterrupted employment, the manuscript gradually increasing, volume by volume, till his friends wondered at the perseverance and unflagging interest which a single subject of a metaphysical nature had inspired."

The portion of the work now published, and extending to the end of the fourth century, will be found a very valuable acquisition to the library of the theologian. The extracts are given in their original languages, as well as in English.

IX.—*An Introduction to Conchology ; or, Elements of the Natural History of Molluscous Animals.* By GEORGE JOHNSTON, M.D., LL.D., Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh. London : Van Voorst.

THIS elaborate work is intended to present a view to the conchologist of the economical, physiological, and systematical relations of Molluscous Animals to each other, and to other created beings ; and it is believed that, it is the only work in the English language in which this attempt has been made. The author acknowledges his obligations to J. E. Gray, Esq., keeper of the Zoological Collection in the British Museum, for many valuable contributions to the work. It is thrown into the form of Letters, and is written in a pleasing style. As some of our readers may need some explanation of the term MOLLUSCA, the author shall explain himself:—

"It was Cuvier, who first of all gathered together these animals, hitherto scattered among many classes, and assigned to the group, or sub-kingdom, the denomination of MOLLUSCA, a term in previous use, but which had been very vaguely defined and applied. They are so named, because they have soft fleshy bodies, devoid of bones. They are readily distinguished from all above them in the animal kingdom, by the want of an interior skeleton, and by the colourless condition of their blood ; and from insects and worms, they are distinguished with equal facility ; for the body of the Mollusca is never divided, like that of insects and worms, into rings, nor invested with a hard crust or

skin, fitted like a coat of mail to the junctures, nor even furnished with jointed limbs and organs of progression. On the contrary, the Mollusca have a soft undivided body, covered with an irritable mucous skin, moistened with a viscous liquor, which exudes from it; this skin, in very many instances, is ample enough to be formed into membranes and fleshy folds," &c. &c.

It appears that there are no less than 15,000 species of these "viscous" animals in the world. We should not exactly like to be obliged to follow this study certainly, as far as the animals themselves are concerned, though we admire the CONCHIFERA, for the endless beauty and variety of their shells. Notwithstanding our prejudices, however, against many of the tribes whose history is narrated in this work by Mr. Johnston, we are bound to say, that his book is full of amusement, as well as of general information and scientific research; and to all who are interested in the habits, dwellings, and organization of this sub-kingdom of the creation, we commend the work before us, in the fullest confidence that they will derive advantage of all kinds from its perusal. We should add, that it is copiously illustrated by well-executed wood-cuts.

x.—HΘΙΚΩΝ ΑΡΕΤΩΝ ΥΠΟΤΥΠΩΣΙΣ. *A Selection from the Nichomachean Ethics of Aristotle, containing a Delineation of the Moral Virtues, with Notes, and an Introductory Discourse.* By WILLIAM FITZGERALD, M.A., *Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin, &c.* Dublin: Hodges and Smith.

A VERY neatly executed and well got up publication. It is intended for the use of senior sophisters in the University of Dublin. Mr. Fitzgerald's notes and preface evince much familiarity with his subject.

xi.—*The Life, Letters, and Opinions of William Roberts, Esq.* Edited by his Son, ARTHUR ROBERTS, M.A., *Rector of Woodrising, Norfolk, &c.* Seeleys: London.

THE subject of this biography, who is chiefly known to us as the writer of Mrs. Hannah More's Life, was one of those good old staunch Tories, and Church and State men, who flourished in the days of Pitt and Eldon, and other worthies of those times. He was a vigorous opponent of liberalism in religion and politics, an antagonist of Whiggery, the *Edinburgh Review*, tractarianism, popery, &c.; and in the latter part of his life became imbued with evangelical views. He edited for some time the *British*

*Review*, a staunch Tory and anti-popish journal, and was in consequence noticed by some leaders of the Tory party, who obtained for him some posts under Government, of which he was deprived by the Whigs. There are not many materials for biography here; the chief interest being from the occasional introduction of greater personages on the scene. Mr. Roberts was a good and highly-respectable man; but we scarcely think he was of that class whose biographies the world will feel much interest about.

XII.—*Sermons. By the Rev. ANDREW HUDLESTON, D.D., Rector of Bowness, &c.* London: Whittaker.

THESE sermons appear to be adapted for a country congregation, dealing as they do in explanation of elementary truths, and in homely and simple illustrations. As a specimen of the style, we must quote the following passage from a sermon on Christmas-day, in which the preacher, in speaking of the office of our Lord, speaks thus:—

“In this respect, then, He was a Saviour, in the most eminent and emphatical sense of that expression; inasmuch as He came into the world, not to save us from the common evils of life, which are permitted as trials to exercise and improve our virtue, but to save us, in a spiritual sense, from the greater and worst of all possible evils,—the dominion, the drudgery, the guilt, and the punishment of our sins. The appellation of Saviour had indeed been anticipated before our Lord’s birth, by an angel of God, who in a dream is made thus to expostulate with Joseph, the husband of Mary, the mother of Jesus: ‘Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife; for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost, and she shall bring forth a Son, and thou shalt call His name Jesus; for He shall save His people from their sins.’ This name of Saviour had, we know, been given to characters of a very opposite description; to those mighty heroes and conquerors of antiquity who had preserved the safety of their respective countries by defensive, or had enlarged the boundaries of them by aggressive warfare, and sometimes to those great and wise legislators who had provided for their internal peace and security by wholesome laws and salutary municipal regulations; but the name of Saviour will not apply to our blessed Lord in any of these senses.”

We quite concur in the truth of this; indeed, we presume it will be so generally admitted, that it would scarcely have occurred to us as necessary to state the fact; and we must add, in candour, that there are occasionally statements of the same kind, which wear, at first sight, *rather* the character of what are called “truisms.” Still we are bound to say that the author exhibits no deficiency in the reasoning powers. His sermons



are in many places closely and argumentatively written; and his views are strictly orthodox. Infidelity, Methodism, and Calvinism are met and refuted. There is a highly complimentary dedication to the Earl of Lonsdale, who, we suppose, is a sort of sovereign in that part of England.

XIII.—*Fides Laici.* London: J. W. Parker.

THIS little poem is designed chiefly for the purpose of censuring certain proceedings of some members of the Church, opposed to the Evangelical section, whom the author considers to be Romish, or otherwise objectionable. He appears to be attached to the English Church; but there is not much ability in his verses.

XIV.—*Parish Musings in Verse.* By JOHN S. B. MONSELL, *Chancellor of Connor, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THE author of this little volume modestly disclaims any merit in his poems, except their practical nature. They do not exhibit, in our opinion, any indications of very high poetical genius; but they are not unpleasingly written: and to very many persons their simple piety combined with tolerable versification, will render them very acceptable.

XV.—*A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway on the present aspect of Church Affairs.* By Sir ARCHIBALD EDMONSTONE, *Bart.* London: Masters.

AMONGST the pamphlets which have appeared in reference to the present state of the Church, we have not perused any with more satisfaction than that of Sir Archibald Edmonstone. It is full of good sense and good principle,—two things which are not always combined. Sir Archibald Edmonstone sees distinctly the dangers of the Church, and points them out; but his remedy consists in vigorous actions, for the purpose of removing these dangers. He meets the common objections against Convocation very satisfactorily; and he is confident that our cause will be extensively supported, if it is rightly put forward. On this point we must extract one passage, in which we are happy to find our own opinion confirmed by Sir Archibald Edmonstone:—

“Not only is unity of purpose, but heartiness in the cause requisite. No one who doubts the Church’s position can effectively fight her battles. And here I cannot but notice an impression, which more

perhaps than any thing, tends to impede our efforts. Many men who have come forward as ardent champions of the Church, have ended in desertion. Hence the fault is laid at the door of the principles they advocate as having a natural tendency towards Rome."

XVI.—*The Tudor Supremacy in Jurisdiction unlimited. A Sermon preached in the Parish Church of Kingsbridge, at the Ordinary Visitation of the Venerable the Archdeacon of Totnes. By ROBERT HENRY FORTESCUE, M.A., Curate of Bigbury, Devon, &c. London: Masters.*

IN the discourse before us, the author shows, and very sufficiently, that the Tudor princes claimed and exercised a supremacy in spiritual matters over the Church of England, which was extreme in various points, and that the Clergy yielded to it more than they might have done. We agree, with Mr. Fortescue, that there is nothing to be gained by denying these facts; they are palpable. The Clergy, however, who yielded to the aggressions of the temporal power, did so when that temporal power was in the strictest alliance with the Church; and when this has been the case, encroachments of the State have been, in most cases, submitted to very patiently. Mr. Fortescue, in the latter part of his sermon, urges the claims of the Church to the right of her spiritual jurisdiction unfettered by the Crown. The following passage is of much interest and value:—

"In contending, then, for the recovery of the Church's just rights in regard of jurisdiction, I would urge, as an essential point, that it is useless to close our eyes upon, or to misrepresent our real position. It is worse than useless to invite discomfiture by assuming a position which cannot be defended,—by insisting, that, in the reigns of Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth, the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy did not invade the indefeasible rights of the Church. But since that doctrine, as understood at the period of the Reformation, and as exercised ever since, *has* involved the right of the Crown to appoint any persons it sees fit, provided only they be 'natural born subjects,' to constitute the court of ultimate appeal in suits involving doctrine, we must take other ground for sustaining our most reasonable claims. We must be bold to say to our rulers, that we think *too much* was then conceded to the Crown, more than the Church had a right to concede, or could alienate from itself. We must plead that no godly prince in Holy Scripture is related to have ever intruded on the priest's office, so far as to assume the judgment of leprosy; and in like manner, no Christian prince should ever have arrogated to himself the judgment of doctrine. We must contend that Henry VIII. professed to claim only such powers as had been exercised by his progenitors; but (as we may truly add) that he usurped more than he claimed. And to the objection,

that the concession for which we ask, would involve an encroachment on the royal prerogatives, we may reply, that such a difficulty has presented no obstacle to the enlargement of the liberties of the people; but that, in temporal matters, the prerogatives enjoyed by the Tudors have been so frittered away by repeated inroads, that now, instead of the strong absolute sway which those princes exercised, the Crown is virtually neutral, its will having been transferred to its responsible advisers; so that, at present, the supremacy of the Crown is, in point of fact, the supremacy of the *Ministers* of the Crown, who may be dissenters, or papists, or infidels. We must plead, also, the *injustice* of the State's still laying on the Church the full weight of its iron hand, to cripple its energies, to adulterate its doctrines, to fill its highest offices with suspected men, when that hand is no longer used to aid it in its work, to enforce its discipline, to coerce or to expel its adversaries, nor, as was promised, for the 'correction of errors, heresies, and schisms.'

"If we be told that our claims are inconsistent with our subscriptions, we may reply, that we think otherwise; that if all our claims were granted, there would still remain to the Crown a most ample supremacy; a supremacy, which the most potent Christian sovereign might be proud to exercise, and, at the same time, be thankful for the opportunities it afforded him of promoting the glory of God, the good of His Church, and the salvation of men. We fully admit, that Convocation may not legally meet, may not frame canons, may not enforce canons, without the royal licence; that, without the same licence, no bishop or ecclesiastical judge may perform one function of his office; that the permission of the secular power, and not that of the Pope, is requisite for the exercise of these rights within the imperial dominions; that, as Henry wrote to Cranmer, before he had fully thought out his theory of derived jurisdiction, they judge by the *licence* and *sufferance* of the Crown; that, further, as eight bishops acknowledged to the king, 'in case the bishops be negligent, it is the Christian prince's office to see them do their duty,'—to see that the laws and canons of the Church be enforced and obeyed; and, moreover, that every temporal penalty, of whatever kind, inflicted for ecclesiastical offences, results from the power, not of the Church, but of the State. We may reply that, in this sense, as we have taken, so we will take, and take conscientiously, the oath, and subscribe to the canon of supremacy; with no mental, but with an *express* reservation, that in this sense, and in this sense alone, we take and subscribe them; and we humbly hope that no bishop or commissary would object that this sense is insufficient. But we must add, that we deem it no rightful exercise of this supremacy,—we deem it tyranny,—absolutely to suppress the Church's power of legislation,—to make those canons which have been passed a dead letter,—to supersede the spiritual judge,—and, because it is found to be no longer politic to aid the discipline of the Church with the coercive influence of the temporal power, to forbid the exercise of all discipline whatever. To those, indeed, who would remind us of our oaths,



we might well reply, that they who imposed them have long since made them inconsistent with facts, and obliged us in some sense to qualify them ; inasmuch as, since the Act of Toleration, the dissenters have been allowed to settle their own purely spiritual causes among themselves, and (as they thought fit) to sever members from their communion, and to deprive their ministers, without being subject to any appeals to the civil power ; and that, more recently, in consequence of concessions made to papists, the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction in this realm, and the granting of dispensations by a foreign prelate, has been connived at,—nay, more, has been permitted by the laws.”

XVII.—*Homer's Iliad, Books I.—IV., with Critical Introduction and Copious English Notes. By the Rev. T. K. ARNOLD, Rector of Lyndon, &c. London: Rivingtons.*

WE are informed in the preface of this edition, that it is not intended for the mere beginner, but for the pupil of more advanced age, who is fitted by his general knowledge of the laws of Greek construction, to commence the critical study of Homer. The work contains, besides the text, an Abridgment of Thiersch's Treatise on the language of Homer, and very full Notes.

XVIII.—*Posthumous Sermons. By the Rev. GEORGE CRABBE, LL.B., Author of "The Borough," &c. Edited by J. D. HASTINGS, Rector of Trowbridge. London: Hatchards.*

THESE discourses are characterized by good sense and lucid argument. They are almost wholly practical, and are generally sound ; but we do not like the tone of the author in speaking of the Holy Communion, in reference to which, he explains away, in a mode which appears to us very unsatisfactory, the language of the Catechism ; and virtually removes all mystery from the subject.

XIX.—*St. George for England ! An Address to, and Correspondence with, certain Persons disaffected to the Established Constitution. By a MEMBER OF THE ENGLISH BAR. London: Rivingtons.*

WE fear that the time for rallying men by the cry of “ St. George for England ” is gone by. Men in the present day care nothing for the past ; have very little regard for established institutions, except in so far as they are personally interested in them. We are speaking, of course, of the active and ruling spirit of the age. The inactive and helpless majority think differently, and grumble exceedingly at the innovations they see around them ; but they have no spirit to join the “ St. George for England ” party,

because they have no leaders, and are as apathetic as they are amiable. We agree with this "Barrister" in admiring the old theory of the Union of Church and State, as represented by Hooker. It was a reality in the days of Hooker; but even the "Barrister" does not shut his eyes to the inroads which have been made on that theory by the course of legislation for the last thirty years. He sees that such facts as "Catholic Emancipation," the "Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts," the "Godless Colleges," the "Maynooth Bill," &c., are all directly in the teeth of this theory. The "Barrister" imagines that the theory can go on very well notwithstanding, and that we are to regard the supremacy as exercised by ministers nominated by a creedless House of Commons, in just the same point of view as our forefathers did when it was exercised by an Elizabeth or a Charles. We are sorry that it must be our fate to differ from the "Barrister."

xx.—*Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts. Forming the Second Series of Sacred and Legendary Art. By Mrs. JAMIESON.* London: Longmans.

THE many readers and admirers of Mrs. Jamieson's former work will look with interest to the appearance of a continuation, illustrated by the pencil of the gifted authoress. It is a compendious series of lives of the Romish saints, and as such, we should not put it into every one's hands in these days. To artists and connoisseurs, however, it will be found particularly useful.

xxi.—*The Paradise of the Christian Soul, delightful for its choicest pleasures of Piety of every kind. By JAMES MERLO HORSTIUS, of the Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary, &c.* London: Burns and Lambert.

THIS is a translation at full length of a work of Roman Catholic devotion, which has been already partially translated and modified by a member of the Church of England. It is, doubtless, extremely well adapted for the use of Romanists, and is neatly got up, though the illustrations are in a poor style of art. The species of devotion is this:

"Transfix the marrow of my soul, O lovely Jesus, with the sweetly penetrating arrow of Thy love, that my soul may be wounded and may languish with the inmost love of Thee and of Thy wounds; and then, being entirely dissolved into love of Thee, may melt away, and be wholly absorbed into Thee, and inseparably adhere to Thee. Amen. *Our Father, Hail Mary.*"

This style of address, combined with ardent prayer to Saints, and such other practices of Romish devotion, will no doubt render the little work before us highly popular in Romish circles. To others it is, of course, wholly unsuited.

xxii.—*Essays, Political, Historical, and Miscellaneous.* By ARCHIBALD ALISON, LL.D., *Author of the History of Europe, &c.* Vol. III. Edinburgh: Blackwood.

THE collected essays of Mr. Alison furnish one of the most valuable contributions to English literature made in our day. They consist of a series of articles contributed to "Blackwood's Magazine" during the last twenty years, and embrace a great variety of topics, historical, political, and literary. We can assure the reader that he will find a large fund of amusement and of information in these volumes. The last article but one in the volume before us contains an exposition of the political state of the empire, arising out of the Reform Bill, which is full of melancholy, and we fear, but too well-founded anticipations of the fall of England.

xxiii.—*Eastern Churches. Containing Sketches of the Nestorian, Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian Communities.* By the Author of "*Proposals for Christian Union.*" Second Edition. London: Darling.

THIS little volume contains much interesting and curious information on the subject of the Eastern Churches, conveyed in a light and amusing style.

xxiv.—*Regeneration; or, Divine and Human Nature. A Poem, in Six Books.* By GEORGE MARSLAND. London: Pickering.

THE author of this work appears to be a Wesleyan Methodist, as it is dedicated to Dr. Dixon, late President of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, as "one of the greatest and best of men." The author states, that he has written under the influence of inspiration: "I am conscious to myself that my mind has been, to a great extent, the passive instrument of the Great Spirit, who, through me, speaks to the world; and yet, whatever may be unworthy of God's glory I must take the blame of to myself. I have desired to produce a work that might be thought worthy to be offered up by the High Priest of Error as a propitiation to Satan." We should scarcely have supposed that Mr. Marsland could have expected such an issue of his



labours, though he is pretty severe upon priests and Established Churches. We have no doubt that he will remain undisturbed by any persecution. His poem is a very respectable one ; rather more like an essay or a sermon than a poem. The author is a staunch Protestant.

“ No wonder that the Popes  
 Forbid the reading of God’s Word ; for that  
 Would show the cheat. Light has appeared on earth,  
 But they have chosen darkness to prefer,  
 Because their deeds are evil ; fearful lest  
 They, by that light reprov’d, should be condemned.  
 Were I to hold an order up to view  
 Of universal execration, as  
 Unfit to live, the serpents of our race,  
 The Jesuits are the men ; no word can reach  
 So low to meet their case, a libel on  
 Our race, who scruple not to dress in garb  
 Of deep sincerity, the wicked heart  
 That has conspired with solemn vows to rob  
 The world of liberty.”

This will convey some notion of the style in which this work is written.

xxv.—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the United Dioceses of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, at his Ordinary Visitation in October, 1848. By JAMES THOMAS O'BRIEN, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin.* London : Seeleys.

DR. O'BRIEN has favoured the Church, in his present Charge, with a lengthened exposition of his views of the Alliance of Church and State, and states many truths, which will be undisputed by Churchmen. Without doubt, Dr. O'Brien is perfectly right in pointing out what he conceives to be the State's duty towards the Church ; but his lordship appears to forget that the legislation in which he tells us that he himself and his friends concurred—the removal of all legal disabilities from Romanists and dissenters—has made them a part of the State, and that the State cannot therefore be expected to extend any peculiar favour to the Established Church, except as a mere State establishment.

“ I am myself one of those who, regarding the removal of all *civil* disabilities connected with the profession of religion as essential to the perfect enfranchisement of conscience, earnestly desired this measure, and rejoiced when it was at last passed. The time, the mode, and all the circumstances under which it was carried, rendered it certain that the good results which might have been fairly expected from it, if it

had been granted earlier, could be very partially, if at all, attained ; and, indeed, made it likely that evils would follow from it which were no proper effect of the measure itself. But still I regarded it, upon the whole, as no mean good. And as to the security of the Church,—though I certainly did not hope that her conflict with her enemies would cease,—yet I desired to see her contending, if she must contend, for what it was a direct duty to maintain, and what therefore could be maintained with a clear conscience and upon intelligible principles, rather than for outworks which every one would feel it was her duty to give up, unless they were absolutely necessary to her preservation. While many regarded them as so far from having that claim to be upheld, that, on the contrary, they brought danger, not security, to her ; not merely by stimulating the hostility of those upon whom they so severely pressed, but by dividing and arraying in hostile parties those who ought to be all united in her defence.

“It must be owned that the course of events since, seems to have justified the wisdom of those friends of the Church who so long and so strenuously contended for the maintenance of such distinctions, as essential to her security. I do not think that point so clear as many are not unnaturally disposed to regard it. But whether these friends of the Church judged rightly or not as to the securities which they desired to retain for her, they certainly did not, in their worst anticipations, overrate the bitterness and perseverance with which she has been assailed since they were surrendered.

“For obvious reasons connected with her position as the Church of the minority, the Church in Ireland had been the principal object of those fears. It was not unnaturally apprehended, that the Roman Catholics in this country looked with a jealous eye on the possessions of our Church, regarding them as of right belonging to their own. It was in vain that they averred that they did not covet any such provision for their Church. Few of those whom this renunciation was intended to satisfy believed it ; and there were still fewer who doubted that, even if it were so far sincere that they had no desire to obtain them for their own Church, yet they were anxious to take them away from ours. They were now, it was said, pursuing another object, which not only gave them abundant occupation, but supplied very cogent reasons for not stirring claims or revealing designs which would excite alarm, and convert many of their best friends into enemies, and raise the most serious obstacles in the way of attaining their more immediate end. But it was confidently predicted, that if *it* were once obtained, all this reserve would disappear, and the Church—when she had divested herself of the most important of the means of defence with which the provident solicitude of earlier times had furnished her—would be seen, too late, to be the first object of their hostility.

“Such apprehensions of the consequences of removing Roman Catholic disabilities, were openly expressed by the friends of the Church. And the Roman Catholics were certainly not deficient in efforts to allay them. Their bishops and their political leaders testified, that the mea-

sure which they pressed on the Legislature would have the effect of taking away all grounds for such fears. If the position of the Established Church, as endowed and exalted, were looked upon with discontent by Roman Catholics, it was only because they themselves were suffering under the invidious and injurious civil disabilities which were connected with the profession of their religion. But, were these taken away, the Church might rest secure in its possessions; and, at least, would be in no danger from the hostility of Roman Catholics.

“To set at rest, however, such fears more decisively, a special provision for the security of the Church was embodied in the Bill for the removal of Roman Catholic disabilities. It was argued: ‘If any danger is to arise to the Established Church from throwing open to Roman Catholics seats in Parliament, and the various places of power and trust from which they have been excluded hitherto, it must be from some use which they are to make of the power thus acquired. But if, in every case, before such power is bestowed upon them, they are bound by an oath, man by man, never to use it to destroy or injure the Church, all such fears ought to be set at rest.’

“Accordingly, such an oath was framed and embodied in the Emancipation Act; and, in conformity with the provisions of the Act, this oath is actually taken by every Roman Catholic member of both houses, before he takes his seat, and by every Roman Catholic appointed to any of the offices under the Crown which have been thrown open by that Act, before he enters upon his office.

“The amount of protection which this precautionary measure has extended to the Church, is well known. All the power acquired under the Bill, as well as all otherwise possessed by the Roman Catholics, very soon began to be exerted, and has been ever since exerted by them, (with a few most honourable exceptions,) in Parliament, and out of it, to overthrow the Protestant Church Establishment in this country. Of course they were not permitted to make such a use of the power entrusted to them, without being reminded of the oath which was intended to guard against it. But almost equally, of course, they loudly and indignantly denied that they were violating any obligations which it laid upon them!

“The oath does not appear to have been particularly well framed for its purpose; but its purpose was, and is, universally known; and its language, however deficient it may be in perfect exactness, is not so loose as to leave its meaning open to any reasonable doubt. But it has been subject to a process which language is not capable of resisting. And the statesman or lawyer who framed it, whoever he be, may be comforted under its failure, by the reflection, that the case in which his formula has failed, is one in which no other could have succeeded.”

This is altogether a very poor comfort for those who took part in carrying “Catholic Emancipation.” Any one, possessed of common sense, could have seen, that to give direct political power to



the most bitter enemies of the Church, would do nothing but endanger that Church. Such persons as Dr. O'Brien had not the excuse of being unwarned. They persisted in their measure, in spite of the warnings and the most strenuous resistance of the really faithful part of the Church; and they have now the result before them. To such as Dr. O'Brien the impending ruin of the Irish Church is wholly and exclusively to be attributed. From open opponents of the Church we expect destructive measures; but it was only when a part of the garrison betrayed the fortress of the Constitution, that it fell into the hands of the foe. To reverse such steps is impossible. They are certain to conduct to ruin; and it is perfectly in vain for Dr. O'Brien, and such persons as him, to call upon the State to act now upon principles which he himself taught it to relinquish legislatively.

XXVI.—*Rig-Veda - Sankhita. A Collection of Ancient Hindu Hymns, constituting the first Ashtaka or Book of the Rig-Veda, the oldest authority for the Religious and Social Institutions of the Hindus. Translated from the original Sanskrit. By H. H. WILSON, M.A., F.R.S., &c. London: Allen.*

THE importance and value of this work to all who are engaged in studies bearing on the Hindu religion, cannot be too highly estimated. Mr. Wilson's eminent distinction as a Sanscrit scholar inspires perfect confidence in the accuracy of his version, and the annotations appended tend greatly to the elucidation of these extraordinary remains of heathenism. It is curious to mark their immense inferiority in all respects to the books of the Old Testament with which they may vie in antiquity. In the Rig-Veda, the usual address of the suppliant is to the Deity to accept and partake of his offering. The Deity is always supposed to drink the soma juice offered to him—a strong spirituous liquor.

XXVII.—*A Letter to Archdeacon Hare, with respect to his Pamphlets on the Gorham Question. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., &c. London: Masters.*

IN this letter, Mr. Neale very satisfactorily exposes the latitudinarianism of Mr. Hare, and remarks on the violence of his language, and the attempt to stifle the expression of opinion on the part of the Clergy of his archdeaconry. Mr. Neale will find that there is no class of men so intolerant of differences of opinion, and so violent in their language, as those who object to party spirit, and advocate unbridled liberty of conscience.

xxviii.—*Emperors of Rome, from Augustus to Constantine. Being a Continuation of the History of Rome. By MRS. HAMILTON GRAY.* London: Hatchards.

THE best written short history of the Roman Emperors we remember to have seen. The history of each reign is succeeded by collateral information of all kinds bearing on the subject, and this agreeably relieves the dryness of a compendious history.

xxix.—*The Poor Artist; or, Seven Eye-sights and One Object.* London: Van Voorst.

A VERY amusing extravaganza, in which flies, ants, spiders, &c., are made to hold conversations, in a very spirited style, with an artist.

xxx.—*Record of the College of Christ Church, in Brecon. By the Rev. JERMYN PRATT.* London: Masters.

THIS publication points out a very disgraceful state of things at the Collegiate Church of Brecon:—

“ Having now given a description of the *ample* endowment of the College of Christ Church, Brecon, its charter, and archiepiscopal order for its rules and regulations to be strictly observed, it remains now only briefly to present the reader with an account of its present dilapidated condition.

“ All that now exists of this collegiate fabric is the chancel, which is about sixty feet long by twenty-five wide, and contains stalls for the dean, treasurer, precentor, and prebendaries, in oak painted lead colour; with the names of the respective parishes annexed to their prebends, in gilt letters on the back of each. It has eleven narrow windows on the north side, and four on the east end of the south side. The two most to the westward on the south side are blocked up to receive a marble monument erected to the memory of Richard Lucy, Chancellor of St. David's. There are three sedilia and two piscinæ. The two most westward sedilia are blocked up by the above-mentioned monuments to Richard Lucy. The piscinæ and only sedile to be seen are given in a drawing with this record.

“ Nothing can exceed the filthy state of this sacred edifice. The roof even now scarcely resists the rain, although subscriptions have, within the last three years, been raised by private individuals to repair it; and also to mend the windows, through which the boys of the town, previous to their being put in order, had free access. The dean and prebendaries were, at the time of raising the subscription, all applied to; but almost all refused to lend their aid to so laudable an undertaking.

“ The ceiling of this building is daily falling, and is allowed to remain

as it falls, upon the pavement below,—no one being employed to clear the dust and mortar away.

“ It appears that prayers were read, and a sermon preached, till about the year 1839 ; and the cause of the suspension of Divine service was, that the roof was considered too insecure to allow the usual duty to be performed with safety.

“ The prebendaries used to reside in their turns, for a short time, in the memory of many persons living in Brecon ; but none have kept residence for the last twenty years.

“ The school, however, was kept up till 1845 ; but from the inefficiency of the schoolmaster, (who nominally held the office of lecturer as well,) it dwindled away to a very few boys, and now there is none at all—*neither school, service, or lecture*. The small building set apart for the school-room is perfectly unfit for the purpose, and would, indeed, be a disgrace to the smallest population in any parish.

“ The entrance to this collegiate church is through an archway of the old nave, by a miserable, rickety pair of old doors. They are merely fastened by a chain and padlock, which the person who has charge of the ruins, and who still retains his nominal office of clerk or sexton, is obliged to find at his *own cost*. He has received no salary since September, 1834. He was then paid by the register five pounds per annum for his services as clerk, and ten shillings for washing the surplice. The clerk also used to receive ten shillings and sixpence for every new prebendary installed.

“ The piece of ground, containing about two and a half to three acres, which from its position was evidently the cemetery of the College, is a grass field to the north, adjoining the old fabric ; and even if its position did not accurately mark it out as the burial-place attached to the College, from time immemorial it has always been considered as such by the inhabitants of Brecon,—and such a supposition is fully established by the following circumstance. In 1845, while they were widening the road from Carmarthen to Brecon, which abuts on the piece of land just mentioned, four human skulls, together with some bones, were exhumed. In spite of this proof of the sanctity of this close, (as it is called,) it is now let as pasture by the Bishop of St. David's for sixteen pounds per annum ; and, moreover, a circus for horsemanship, almost every year, is allowed to be erected in the centre of this hallowed spot.

“ The leases of several small parcels of land in the immediate vicinity of this College have lately fallen in, and the Bishop of St. David's does not intend to renew them.

“ There is no doubt but that this record will be censured by many persons now enjoying emoluments from this sacred foundation. It is at once admitted that it may be (from the difficulty of acquiring facts) in some measure inaccurate ; but it is nevertheless sent into the world, in order to be the means of giving information to those in authority—of correcting, if possible, one of the grossest abuses of Church property, and in the earnest hope that this ancient College may yet be set apart



for the purpose for which it was originally transferred and endowed, viz. to supply scriptural education to the poor—‘to improve the morals of the King’s liege subjects,’ and advance the honour and glory of God.”

XXXI.—*An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Creed of the Church of Rome. Part II. Original Sin and Justification. By CHARLES SMITH, B.D., Rector of Newton, &c.* London: J. W. Parker.

IN this work Mr. Smith examines, with much ingenuity and erudition, the Decrees of the Synod of Trent on Original Sin and Justification, connecting with them the various tenets and practices to which they lead, and commenting with much ability on the writings of modern controversialists in the Church of Rome. The work is rather discursive in its character, but it bears evidence of research and of ingenuity.

XXXII.—*Church Hymns; or, Hymns for the Sundays, Festivals, and other Seasons of the Ecclesiastical Year, as observed in the Church of England. Compiled, with an Introduction, by HENRY STRETTON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Hixon.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS collection of Hymns appears to have been made with much judgment and care; and it seems to us, on the whole, more practically adapted to the use of the Church than any we have yet seen. Many of these Hymns are taken from ancient sources, and are very beautiful. We should be glad to see such a collection as this in general use.

XXXIII.—*Canterbury Papers. Information concerning the principles, &c., of the Founders of the Settlement of Canterbury, in New Zealand.* London: J. W. Parker.

THE Canterbury Settlement is a great experiment, to which we cordially wish success; but we presume that this colony, like others, will have its difficulties to contend with, notwithstanding the excellence of the soil, the fineness of the climate, and the other natural advantages, so temptingly placed before the colonist in the work before us. The founders of the Settlement have undoubtedly proceeded on right principles in their whole plan. There is one point, however, on which we feel obliged to make some observations at the present time. The endowment of the new See of Lyttelton is to be provided, we apprehend, by the colonists themselves, and in no degree by the State. On what ground, therefore, can the Crown justly claim the right of ap-

pointing the Bishop? We presume that the colonists do, in fact, appoint their own Bishop; but ought there not to be more than a secret understanding with the Government on this point? Ought it to be left in the power of future Governments to misunderstand the question, and to nominate without consulting the colonists?

xxxiv.—*Tracts on the Church. By the Rev. WILLIAM JONES, M.A., some time Rector of Nayland.* Oxford and London: J. H. Parker.

THIS very seasonable publication is one which ought to be extensively circulated amongst the middling and lower classes. It is precisely adapted to a parish lending library. The object is the defence of the Church of England against her various opponents. The author was a true and faithful Churchman, and, having lived in times long prior to our present controversies, his testimony is the more valuable.

xxxv.—*Sickness, its Trials and Blessings.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS work is from the pen of a Lady, who has herself experienced much sickness, and is therefore competent to advise others. With all that we have seen of it, we have been very much pleased. It is arranged under the following subjects:—The Manner of Looking upon Sickness; Trials and Temptations of Sickness; Duties and Responsibilities; Blessings of Sickness; Convalescence; Death. There is also a special chapter on reading the Scriptures, Sunday, the Holy Communion, and prayers for recovery. The work contains a preface by the Rev. F. C. Massingberd, vouching for its orthodoxy. We can recommend this work with confidence to the attention of invalids.

xxxvi.—“*One Lord, one Faith.*” *Discourses Doctrinal and Occasional. By JOHN BESLY, D.C.L., Vicar of Long Benton, &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THE author of this volume of discourses explains in his preface, that they are enlarged or combined from parochial sermons preached at distant intervals, and without any design of forming a connected series. They do not seem to be very much connected in fact, except by harmony of doctrine. Amongst these sermons we have been particularly gratified by the perusal of Sermon xix. “The Old Paths of Discipline and Doctrine,” in which the author bears testimony to the truth of the English Church, and urges

stedfast adherence to it in all respects. These discourses are very well and carefully written.

XXXVII.—*The Christian Gentleman's Daily Walk.* By Sir ARCHIBALD EDMONSTONE, Bart. Third Edition. London: Masters.

Our readers are doubtless familiar with the former editions of this truly excellent work. Would that the author's portraiture of a Christian Gentleman were more generally realized! but we have no doubt that his testimony has been extensively received, and that it will continue to be so.

XXXVIII.—*A Safe Path for Humble Churchmen; in Six Sermons on the Church Catechism, adapted to the complexion of the Times.* By JOHN MILLER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons.

MR. MILLER could not have selected a better subject for comment than the Church Catechism, which is familiar to all Churchmen, and which possesses so many excellencies. The following testimony from Mr. Miller in his preface will be perused with interest:—

“Any long dissertation here would be at once superfluous and wearisome. Let it be therefore only said, that the great power of the Catechism, as a sound Christian manual, lies in the fulness of its matter brought so simply into so small a compass. Its language could not well be otherwise than *positive* to a certain extent; but nothing can be less *offensively* dogmatic than its tone, while it is equally distinct and unequivocal in its foundations laid, motives supplied, and principles enforced. There is no rashness in it, and no unworthy compromise. Though some perhaps might wish it *less* distinct *here*, and others some what *more* explicit *there*, it is a course of *early Christian teaching*, which no sincere and conscientiously-attached member of our own communion would be content to part with as a whole; even without regard to the consideration that, this once lost or laid aside, no other corresponding general ‘instruction’ would ever be agreed to and accepted in its stead. And probably this wide-spread liking for the Catechism arises greatly from its having been composed without partiality, and with an eye continually kept upon the genuine ‘simplicity’ of *Gospel truths* alone.”

The first sermon is on the “Evil of Unsettledness in Religious Persuasions”—a most weighty subject. Mr. Miller points out the Christian duty of a firm and fixed belief; and then describes the uncertainties and differences unhappily existing amongst men in the present day. Herein he takes occasion to point out to



them the Catechism as a form of sound words in which all may agree. In his next discourse he proceeds to illustrate practically the first baptismal promise, and in the third explains the "three things" which the Apostles' Creed chiefly teaches; and which concludes thus:—

"He that believes in God aright, will be found diligent in rendering to Him the things that are peculiarly His. He will reverence God's holy name, His house, His day, and all things specially belonging to Him. He who believes in a like way, in Jesus Christ, will not forget that our profession is to follow this example, and to be made like unto Him. He who has proper faith in God the Holy Ghost, will care for all those things which specially concern the soul and spirit. He who has due belief in the existence of the *Holy Catholic Church*, will take good care to cleave with stedfastness unto its doctrine and fellowship. If we receive into the heart a fit persuasion of the 'communion of saints,' we shall feel care and love for all our Christian brethren, and honour for the memories of those departed hence in God's true faith and fear. He who believes on solid ground—not merely for the saying of the words—that *sins will be forgiven*, will not forget that they must be *forsaken*; and he who rightly looks for *resurrection and the life to come*, will follow the example of St. Paul and exercise himself because of that belief, always to have a conscience void of offence, toward God, and toward men."

The remaining sermons are on the Identity of the Ten Commandments with the Gospel Two; the Lord's Prayer, as bearing on the Ten Commandments; the Two Sacraments, as implying continuity and stedfastness. These subjects alone will indicate in some degree the interest which even this brief and general treatment of the subject acquires in Mr. Miller's hands. We feel thankful for this valuable testimony to the duty of stedfastness in the faith.

XXXIX.—*A Brief Analysis of the Doctrine and Argument in the Case of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter, with Observations on the present position of the Church of England, with reference to the recent decision.* By LORD LINDSAY. London: Murray.

THE arguments and proceedings on the Gorham case have proceeded to such a length, that such a work as Lord Lindsay has here effected is extremely necessary for those who would have a distinct understanding of the course and mutual bearing of events and arguments. It must be admitted that the battle has been well fought. Though defeated at law, the cause of the Church has gained immensely on the public mind; and a vigorous protest and appeal to the spiritual authority from the temporal has been

made. Lord Lindsay thus concludes his remarks on the proceedings which have taken place:—

“So far from being detrimental, the co-existence and antagonism of these two parties, the High Church and Low Church, have been most advantageous and beneficial to the Church of England. Each party has alternately asserted the great truths which more peculiarly animate its existence—each has alternately prevailed—and every struggle has left the Church on a higher vantage-ground than before, and nearer the recognition of Universal Truth—the Church (as comprehensive of both the parties in question) recognizing impartially and adopting as her own whatever wisdom or clearer perception of Truth has been contributed by either side or elicited in the collision. The experience of the last few years justifies this assertion. The Church, after a long struggle with Puritanism and Romanism, ending with the seventeenth century, had vindicated her position, rooted herself in the land, and impregnated the people with reverence for her authority. But, while defending her outworks, with but champions too few for the duty, it had been impossible adequately to tend the moral soil—the effort had been too great, and after the enemy had retired, she sat languid and exhausted till the middle of last century. By that time she had recovered herself, and, with God’s blessing and obeying His impulse, she arose and girded herself to the work of evangelizing the nation—and from that moment till the present all has been renewed and continued progress. First came the Subjective, or, as it is popularly styled, the Evangelical movement—awakening the sense of Individual Guilt, Redemption, and Responsibility; and then, in necessary sequence and relation to it, the Objective, or, as it is similarly styled, the Puseyite—restoring the true idea of the Church, as the Mystical Body of our Saviour,—the former converting us individually from sin as ‘children of God,’ the latter expanding our sympathies and duties as ‘members of Christ,’ and both unitedly preparing us for Eternity as ‘inheritors of the kingdom of heaven:’—

“That, as might be expected from this comprehensive character of the Church of England, she confines her dogmatical teaching to such points as are absolutely ruled by direct Revelation and the judgment of Catholic Antiquity as tests of salvation; and, even in these, makes allowance, so far as permissible, for the diversity of Objective and Subjective vision incidental to the present constitution of Human Nature—demanding only in such cases that neither view be held so absolutely as to exclude the other:—

“That, applying the preceding principles and considerations to the question now at issue, it would appear—That the High Church dwell so earnestly on the Sacramental virtue of Baptism as conferring grace on the recipient infant, and incorporating it with the Church, the Body of Christ, as comparatively to under-estimate the condition of faith and repentance required from him, and on the redemption of which, on attainment to the age of responsibility, the preservation of the grace in

question depends:—And that the Low Church, on the contrary, dwell so earnestly on the condition on which grace is given, as comparatively to under-estimate the Sacramental virtue of Baptism, and the benefit of incorporation above stated as thereby conferred:—Whereas, the doctrine of the Church, as comprehensive both of High Church and Low Church—the doctrine expressed in her recognized formularies and authorities, and stated in the preceding summary of the Bishop of Exeter's argument, though perhaps more fully than the Bishop or his advocates have thought it necessary to enunciate it—lays EQUAL stress on the grace conferred, and on the condition upon which it is conferred, and by non-redemption of which it is forfeited:—

“That individual members of the High Church and Low Church parties, who through their peculiar Objective or Subjective idiosyncrasy attach inordinate importance either to the one or the other view of the question, are not guilty of heresy, so long as they do not assert either view to the exclusion of the other:—

“That Mr. Gorham, individually, has asserted Subjective to the utter and absolute exclusion of Objective Truth as regards the grace of Baptism, and in so doing has diverged into heresy,—but that in this he differs, as it is believed, from the majority of the Low Church party,—who ought, if such be the case, to vindicate their orthodoxy by expressing their dissent, not from his opinions in general, but from his special error:—

“That the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have, as it is conceived, overlooked this heresy, but they have not sanctioned it. They have merely sanctioned certain opinions which they attribute to Mr. Gorham, and which, though they separate Baptism and Grace in point of time, still connect them substantially with each other, but which opinions are not Mr. Gorham's opinions in their full extent—do not, as his do, absolutely separate Baptism and Grace—do not therefore deny the Nicene Creed—and do not consequently amount to heresy. The Judicial Committee do not moreover assert, that the opinions which they attribute to Mr. Gorham are the doctrine held and intended to be taught by the Church, but rather the contrary,—their sanction therefore amounts to nothing more than a grant of legal toleration to such opinions. But even had the sanction thus given included the whole of Mr. Gorham's doctrines and affirmed heresy, such sanction, weighed against the Creeds and Catholic consent inherited by the Church from the Apostolic ages—fallibility, in a word, weighed against infallibility—could not blot out the Truth, thus binding upon her, nor compromise her Catholicity, so long as she did not, by a formal, conscious, deliberate act, of her own free will, rescind and repudiate what she at present professes to hold:—

“That Churchmen ought not to be discouraged by the failure of the measure recently introduced by the Bishop of London, inasmuch as the perils to which the Church is exposed by the present system of appeals, and the necessity of such a measure, are as yet but very imperfectly known or appreciated. The principle is in the meanwhile conceded,



that the present system is objectionable, and this is of itself an instalment of justice. 'Endure' ought therefore to be the motto of the Church at the present moment,—Time and Truth will work together in her cause, and failure may be followed up by success.—The Bill itself, supported by a very large majority of the Bishops, is likewise, in the interim, a protest of the Church, repudiating the interpretation supposed to be affixed by the Privy Council to her formularies and articles—a protest, to be followed, it is to be hoped, by a manifesto of the Bishops declaring and re-affirming the faith of the Church—which, though not perhaps strictly necessary, is most desirable in order to calm the public mind.—But under any circumstances it must be insisted upon, that neither the sanction given by the Privy Council to the teaching of one whom it is sad to be compelled to term a heretic, nor the defeat of the Bishop of London's Bill, nor any conceivable (or rather, inconceivable) accumulation of oppression, can furnish either cause or excuse to any one for quitting the Church for another communion. The duty of her chivalry is to stand by her, to defend her to the death:—

"That, finally, if any persist in quitting the communion of the Church of England in consequence of the recent decision, Rome can afford them but slender consolation, inasmuch as she is more grievously and hopelessly compromised on the question of Baptism than such persons suppose the Church of England to be,—to say nothing of her mutilation of the Eucharist in denying the cup to the laity, and other points of difference with ourselves. Whereas, on the other hand, if our friends must leave us, they may find refuge in the communion of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, a daughter of their mother Church, holding the same doctrine, and possessing the same comprehensive character, but untrammelled by State influence, and in no wise affected by the recent decision."

We trust no one will *leave* the Church of England in order to find refuge in the Church of Scotland, notwithstanding our cordial adhesion to that Church. In the English Church they were born to God, and to it they should adhere with inviolable fidelity, whatever may happen, that there may never be wanting men to uphold its cause, and carry on the succession of its faith and discipline. No; let them never leave the English Church for the Scottish, but let them look to the Scottish as a sister Church which possesses the power of restoring the Catholic succession of Bishops in England, if the clergy and laity should ever be compelled, through the apostasy of their Bishops, to elect faithful men in their stead. In *this* way the Scottish Church may yet save the Church of England; but there is no indication of any such necessity being likely to occur; still less could there be any reason for leaving the English Church, and thus flying like cowards from the contest for England's faith.

XL.—*Sermons. By the Rev. RICHARD TOMLINS, M.A., formerly Curate of Uttoxeter.* London: Masters.

MR. TOMLINS has a better right to publish his discourses than nine men out of ten of the writers we meet with. His sermons are excellent, intelligible, vigorous, well-reasoned, and orthodox.

XLI.—*Sacra Privata. The Private Meditations, Devotions, and Prayers of the Right Rev. T. WILSON, D.D., late Bishop of Sodor and Man. Adapted to general use.* Oxford: John Henry Parker.

IN this edition no additions or alterations of language have been permitted, but those parts which refer exclusively to the Clergy have been omitted. It is delightful to return to the simple and elevated devotion of Wilson, after contemplating the exaggerated ecstasies and familiarities of Romish and Wesleyan devotion.

XLII.—*The Changes of our Times; or, the History of John Gray of Willoughby.* London: Hatchard.

A VERY interesting little tale, describing the changes in the position of farmers effected by legislative measures, and connecting with these an account of alterations in Church matters, especially the evil effects of novelties in the performance of Divine Service. The author is pretty sharp upon them, but he explains in his preface that he only means to blame those with whom external forms degenerate into a substitute for spirituality.

XLIII.—*The Child's Preacher; or, the Gospel taught to Children in very Simple Language. By the Hon. and Rev. L. BARRINGTON, M.A., Rector of West Tytherley, Hants.* London: Wertheim and Macintosh.

THESE are a series of little sermons to children, delivered at a separate service instituted for them. They are, in our opinion, quite perfect in their way: we can hardly lay down the volume. Let all mothers by all means get this little tome, and read it to their children.

---

A great number of minor publications, single sermons, and pamphlets, are before us, which we are unable on this occasion to notice, through press of other matter.

## Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

AUSTRALIA.—*Meeting of the Bishops of Melbourne and Sydney.*—The Melbourne “Church of England Messenger” gives an interesting account of a meeting between the Bishops of Melbourne and Sydney, at Albury, on the Murray. “If ever that little township attain such eminence as to be noticed by the historian, the fact may be considered worthy of record, that it was the first village in the Bush of Australia that witnessed the meeting of two Bishops of our Church. There was a congregation, both morning and evening, of upwards of 100 persons. It so happened that all the ordinances of the Church were administered; for there were not only several children whose parents were desirous they should be baptized, but four young women, and one young man, wished to avail themselves of the opportunity for receiving Confirmation. In the morning the latter ordinance was administered, and the Bishop of Sydney delivered a short but very impressive address to the parties. The sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was also celebrated; and all those who had just been confirmed partook of it. The Bishop of Melbourne preached in the afternoon. On the Monday, a meeting of the settlers on both sides the river, as well as of the town’s-people, was held; and an arrangement was made for immediately proceeding to build a residence for a Clergyman, who should divide his ministrations between the township and the stations on the two sides of the Murray; and whose stipend should be raised, partly by local contributions, and partly by a grant, which the Bishop of Sydney undertook to procure for at least one year.”

*Romish Missions.*—A large body of Romish ecclesiastics, to the number of thirty-nine, and artisans, headed by Bishop Serra, were landed at Perth, West Australia, from a Spanish ship-of-war, on December 29, 1849. It is reported that the Romish Bishop Salvando is about to remove from North Australia to Albany, in consequence of the abandonment of the former settlement by the British Government.

AUSTRIA.—*German Catholics.*—The “German Catholics,” or “Free-Christians,” in Lower Austria, having been refused recognition by the Government, on the ground of their having no definite creed, have remonstrated against this decision, and handed in the following as the summary of their faith: “I believe in God, and in the existence of the soul after death, and I endeavour deliberately to attain my destiny, the perfection of humanity, through a free development of my reason in the way of love which the sublimest of men, Jesus Christ, has pointed



out as a duty in the words: 'Love God above all, and thy neighbour as thyself.'"

BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—*Synodal Organization of the Church in Canada.*—We mentioned in our last, that a Bill was about to be introduced into the Canadian Legislature by the Honourable P. B. De Blaquiére, for the better government of the Church in Upper Canada, and the establishment of a Provincial Synod. The question was subsequently postponed in consequence of the Bishop's absence, as will be seen from the following correspondence between the Honourable Member and the Clergy of the Diocese :—

"To the Honourable P. B. De Blaquiére, Member of the Honourable the Legislative Council, &c. &c.

"Sir,—Having understood that it is your intention to bring a Bill into the Legislature during the present Session, on the subject of constituting new Bishoprics in this Diocese, and on other matters connected with its temporal and spiritual interests, we beg respectfully to suggest it as our opinion that it would not be advisable to introduce such a measure until the sentiments of the Bishop and Clergy of the Diocese could be officially had upon the subject. In the absence of the Bishop, we should not regard it as proper in itself, or respectful to his Lordship, to recommend to the Clergy the adoption of any action upon this subject,—much less that steps should be taken by them by which to ascertain the sentiments upon the same subject of the Laity of our communion within their respective parishes.

"We are persuaded that if, upon the Bishop's return, any considerable number of the Clergy and Laity should address his Lordship upon the subject to which your proposed Bill refers, and request him to adopt such steps as would most effectually call forth the opinions of the Church generally in this Diocese upon that subject, his Lordship would readily assent, and take the action petitioned for.

"Until, however, some movement is made in the matter by the Church collectively, and her voice in this Diocese ascertained in a regular and legitimate manner, it would, in our judgment, be premature, and defeat, perhaps, the end proposed, to press any measure referring to it upon the consideration of the Legislature.

"We trust, therefore, that, upon these grounds, you will be willing to postpone the introduction of your contemplated Bill until the opinions of the Bishop and Clergy of this Diocese, together with the flocks committed to their charge, can, with his Lordship's sanction and authority, be satisfactorily ascertained.

"We have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient humble servants,

"GEO. O'KILL STUART, LL.D., D.D.,  
Archdeacon of Kingston.

"A. N. BETHUNE, D.D.,  
Archdeacon of York."

"May 27, 1850."

To this, Mr. De Blaquiére replied :—

“ To the Rev. and Ven. the Archdeacons of Kingston and York.

“ *Toronto, June 4, 1850.*

“ Reverend and Venerable Sirs,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 27th ult., and in doing so, I beg of you to believe that in any step which I may take on the subject to which that letter refers, it will be not only my earnest desire to promote the welfare of the Church in Canada, but also my anxious wish to secure the active co-operation of every member of the Church, whether clerical or lay.

“ Agreeing in the views already advocated by his Lordship the Bishop, when Archdeacon of York, and by yourselves, together with a large number of the Clergy, in the year 1836; and believing that the true interests of religion are deeply involved in the speedy assembling of a Convocation, I am willing for the present to postpone the application to the Legislature in behalf of the Church to which I stand pledged, in the hope that by doing so I may hasten this important preliminary step.

“ I am, therefore, induced, on my own responsibility, and in behalf of those of the Clergy and Laity, whose views on this important subject accord with my own, to request that you will convey to the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, our anxious and earnest hope that he will at once, while in England, take the necessary steps for obtaining the sanction of Her Majesty the Queen, for the assembling of a Convocation, either for the Diocese of Toronto, or for the Province of Canada in co-operation with the Lord Bishop of Montreal.

“ As my address respecting the present state of the Church was made known through the press, I deem it necessary, in justice to myself, that your letter and this my reply should obtain equal publicity.

“ I have the honour to be,

“ Reverend and Venerable Sirs,

“ Your faithful humble servant,

“ P. B. DE BLAQUIÈRE.”

Mr. De Blaquiére has since been induced to publish, in a further letter to the Archdeacons, the following additional explanation :—

“ The object of any legislative enactment I could be induced to support, would not interfere with the rights of the Church, but simply place her, in her *‘ corporate capacity, in a position to exercise those rights.’* I hold with yourselves the object of a Convocation to be—*‘ To deliberate on, and to adopt measures for the general interests and more permanent establishment of the Church in this Province; for the more efficient maintenance of discipline and order; for the supply of Ministers where wanted; for the support of those already employed; and for securing unity of design and action in all.’* And I subscribe, *ex animo*, to the proposition that, *‘ In matters purely doctrinal, the Laity shall have no voice.’* May I not then reasonably anticipate the

support of the whole Provincial Church, in my efforts to establish a Convocation? The necessity for such a measure is too generally felt and acknowledged to be called for a moment in question. It is, therefore, my settled purpose to introduce into this Legislature a Bill for the establishment of a Convocation, on the broad principles above stated; and I confidently rely upon the acknowledged judgment and experience of the Bishop of Toronto for assistance in framing such a Bill, and upon the general co-operation of the Clergy and Laity in perfecting it."

In connexion with the present movement for synodal organization, an account, of which the following is an abstract, is given by the *Toronto Church*, of a former attempt to obtain a Provincial synod. A society, called the "Western Clerical Society," was formed at the Rectory, Woodstock, on the 19th of November, 1834, seven Clergymen being present. The proceedings were transmitted to the Bishop of Quebec, who not only gave to the Society his unqualified approbation, but recommended all the Clergy in the West to join it. The fundamental rule of the Society was "to confer on the measures best calculated to advance the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom, and to afford such mutual aid as the circumstances of the Church or of each individual member of this Society may require." In carrying out this object, the attention of the Society was especially directed to the division of the Diocese, and to the establishment of a "Convocation." Frequent conferences were had, and various plans suggested, on which Archdeacon Strachan was generally consulted. On the 4th of November, 1835, the Society (twelve Clergymen being present) resolved,—“That we consider it of essential and vital importance to the welfare of the Church, that a general meeting of the Clergy of this Province be held at as early a period as possible, to confer on the general interests of the Church in the present critical posture of her affairs, especially with regard to the Division of the Diocese,—the provision for a Bishop, and the induction of the Clergy.”

By the unwearied exertions of the Society, a meeting was brought about of all the Clergy of the Archdeaconries of Kingston and York, to the number of thirty-two, including the two Archdeacons, who assembled at St. James' Church, on the 5th October, 1836. Full service was celebrated, and the Holy Communion administered on the occasion, and the meeting afterwards proceeded to the consideration of a plan for the formation of a "Convocation," or "Convention." The following was unanimously adopted:—

“Whereas the Ecclesiastical Law of the United Church of England and Ireland has never been introduced into this Province, by reason of which much inconvenience has arisen in matters of order and discipline; and whereas from the increasing number of Clergy, and the great distances which separate them from one another, there is great want of mutual communication and unity of action in the regulation of Church affairs, and much hindrance is experienced by the Bishop in the exercise of his holy and important functions, it is deemed expedient that



Diocesan Convocations be held in this Province from time to time for the purpose of adopting such rules and regulations of discipline, and taking such measures for the good of the Church, as her particular situation in this Diocese may require, provided the same be not repugnant to the constitution of the United Church of England and Ireland, the laws of the Province, and the prerogative of the Crown. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted at a meeting of the Clergy of Upper Canada, and respectfully submitted to the Lord Bishop of Quebec for his sanction.

"1. That there shall be an annual Convocation or meeting of the Clergy of that portion of the Diocese of Quebec, which is comprehended within the Province of Upper Canada, alternately at Toronto and Kingston, on such day as the Lord Bishop shall consider the most expedient.

"2. That the Convocation shall be composed of such canonically ordained Clergymen as are resident in Upper Canada, and have the cure of souls, whether settled in parishes, or acting as Missionaries; as also of such Clergymen as are employed as professors or instructors of youth in public seminaries; and of not more than two lay-delegates for each rector or stated minister, to be chosen by the members of the Vestry being communicants, from amongst members of the Vestry (being also regular communicants) at the usual Easter Meetings.

"3. That the Convocation shall be opened in Church—the Clergy attending in their robes—with public prayer, a sermon, and the Lord's Supper;—the Bishop appointing the preacher.

"4. That the Bishop, or, in his absence, the Senior Archdeacon, shall preside. In their absence, the President shall be chosen by the Clergy present.

"5. That one or more Secretaries shall be chosen by the Convocation at its annual meeting, whose duty it shall be to keep a record of the proceedings, and to give due notice to each minister and vestry of the time and place of the next meeting.

"6. That in all matters which shall come before the Convocation, the Clergy and Laity shall deliberate in one body; but, in voting, the Clergy shall vote by individuals, and the Laity by congregations. Unless there shall be a majority of both orders, the measure shall be considered as lost. In matters purely doctrinal, the Laity to have no voice.

"7. Special Convocations shall be summoned by the Bishop when he deems it necessary for the good of the Church, or when a requisition to that effect shall be made to him by seven or more Clergymen who have been at least five years in priest's orders.

"8. That the following be the object of the Convocation:—To deliberate on and to adopt measures for the general interests and more permanent establishment of the Church in this province,—for the more efficient maintenance of discipline and order, for the supply of ministers where wanted, for the support of those already employed, and for securing unity of design and action in all.

"9. That no discussion on any measure be had before leave of Convocation be obtained for its introduction.

"10. That every measure adopted in Convocation shall be submitted to the Bishop for his approval, and if so approved, shall become a standing rule for the government of the Church.

"11. That it shall be the duty of every Clergyman to attend the Convocation, that no excuse shall be valid except that of ill-health, extraordinary duty, or permission from the Bishop.

"12. That these fundamental rules be not changed, unless the proposed alteration be submitted at one meeting of the Convocation, for the consideration of the next,—adopted by at least two-thirds of the members of each order present, and sanctioned by the Bishop."

At the suggestion of the Archdeacon of York, the resolutions were sent home for the advice and approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury; and, subsequently, the Bishop of Toronto, in his first charge, gave the substance of the Archbishop's answer, which was to the effect that such a convention could not be allowed, and giving his reasons for such determination. Since then, the subject has been in abeyance until recently, when it has again been revived.

*Toronto Church Society.*—The anniversary meeting of this Society was held,—for the first time in the Bishop's absence,—on the 5th of June last. From the financial statement, it appears that the Society's income during the past year amounted to 306*l.* 15*s.* 8½*d.*, being an increase of 269*l.* upon the previous year. The report makes particular mention of the extension of parochial organization throughout the province:—"Increased attention has been given to the parochial subdivision of labour, in the formation of parochial committees. The organization of these committees in Toronto was noticed in last year's report, and in this city the most beneficial results have accrued from them. Since that time the same course has been pursued in various parishes in the home district and elsewhere. This we must regard as a most judicious movement towards fully carrying out the constitution of the Society, and it is hoped that no long period will elapse before a parochial committee has been similarly established in every parish or mission within the Diocese. The wisdom of the Church's parochial system has been proved by the experience of centuries, and it is certain that there is nothing on which we could depend for doing the work of the Church with the same regularity,—the same even, steady, and constantly-growing efficiency. We wish, therefore, to enlist the full vigour of this admirable system in behalf of the Church Society to the greatest possible extent of which the circumstances of the Diocese will admit. It is not saying too much to affirm, that the Church, except in a position purely and entirely missionary, could not prosper without it; and every one must feel that the Societies of the Church will thrive just in proportion as they contain those integral elements of spiritual life and power which are essential to the Church itself." The parochial system has, it appears, even reached the Red men of the Forest, for "in the Mohawk Mission," the report says, "the annual meeting was

numerously attended, and was rendered particularly interesting by addresses and remarks delivered by the catechist and one of the churchwardens, in their own language."

*Romish Synod at Montreal.*—A Synod of Romish Bishops has met at Montreal, and issued a circular to the Clergy and a pastoral to the Faithful. The latter prohibits the reading of the Bible in any but the Romish version, and without Romish annotations, as well as the perusal of tracts, pamphlets, or any other writings contrary to religion and morals, and enjoins in doubtful cases recurrence to the diocesan authorities—under pain of excommunication.

*Clergy Reserves in Canada.*—In consequence of the adoption by the Provincial Legislature of a Petition to the Queen, for the appropriation of the Clergy Reserves to secular purposes, meetings have been held in various parts of the Province, in opposition to that measure of confiscation. The following resolutions passed at a meeting at Toronto, the Archdeacon of York in the chair, will best explain the state of the case:—

"1. That whereas an address to Her Majesty the Queen has passed the Legislative Assembly of this Province, praying that the lands therein appropriated for the maintenance of religion should be alienated from that object and applied to secular purposes, it is the duty of all sound Christians to protest against the sacrilegious spoliation contemplated in that measure.

"2. That whereas by the act 3 and 4 Victoria, chap. 78, a definite settlement of the question touching the lands called Clergy Reserves was made, according to which the Church of England was secured in a limited share of the revenue derivable from those lands, it is the bounden and solemn duty of Churchmen to resist, by every constitutional means, the breach of faith, the gross injustice, and the great moral injury they would sustain by the success of any measure that would overturn that enactment.

"3. That the Endowments and Reserves secured by that Imperial Act to the Church of England are wholly insufficient for her becoming maintenance in this province; and that the effect of this intended measure of spoliation, should it be successful, will be altogether to deprive the more remote and poor settlements of the regular ministrations of the Church, and that every form of religious error, and even infidelity in its worst shape, must at no distant period be the consequence.

"4. That this meeting views with indignation as well as regret the unjustifiable interference of members of the Legislative Assembly of the Romish communion in this aggression upon the property and privileges of Protestants, and laments the religious animosity and other evil consequences which must ultimately be the result of this ill-advised interference.

"5. That the measure just sanctioned by a majority of the House of Assembly, characterized as it is by want of principle, injustice, and the spirit of infidelity, destroys totally the confidence of Churchmen in that body, and that this meeting do pledge themselves to use their best influence and exertions at the next general election to prevent the return



to the Legislative Assembly of any person who will not pledge himself to respect the endowments of religion and the vested rights of the Church.

“6. That it is the bounden duty of Churchmen in this province to petition the Queen, and the House of Lords and Commons, without delay, and to express in the strongest terms their reprobation of this contemplated measure of spoliation, and to pray that the late decision of the Provincial Assembly upon the Clergy Reserves be disallowed by the Crown.

“7. That the petition recommended by the Archdeacons of Kingston and York in their circular address to the Clergy, subject to such correction as the authorities of the Church may hereafter recommend, be adopted.”

*Bishop's College, Lennoxville.*—The Corporation of Bishop's College, Lennoxville, have addressed a petition to the Provincial Legislature, praying for the power of granting degrees in Arts and in Divinity, and for such an increase of the public grant for its support, as shall place it on an equality with other similar institutions.

*Visitation of the Diocese of Fredericton.*—The second triennial visitation of the Diocese of Fredericton took place on the 11th and 12th of June last. In the course of the proceedings various subjects were discussed by the Clergy under the presidency of the Bishop. His Lordship presented to each Clergyman “A form of Induction to a Benefice in the Diocese of Fredericton,” which he had prepared, together with “A form of preparation for the Consecration of a Church, Chapel, or Burial Ground.” The Bishop further presented each Clergyman with a Catalogue of the Cathedral Library, the gift of the University of Oxford, and other friends, amounting to seven hundred volumes; the rules drawn up by him having been unanimously adopted by the Clergy; and with a copy of “Prayers for a Church Choir,” which he had composed. In his charge, the Bishop observed, in allusion to recent events at home :

“I cannot but earnestly protest against the doctrine that our Church speaks with the stammering lips of ambiguous and uncertain formularies. I desire before God, and as I shall give account hereafter, to receive the words of our Liturgy in their literal and natural sense, and to receive *in its fulness* the great Gospel truth that there is ‘one baptism for the remission of sins!’ I pray God that in this matter we may stand fast in the same mind, and in the same judgment.”

FRANCE.—*Synods.*—The pages of the *Ami de la Religion* are filled with accounts of the Synods taking place in the different dioceses of France. The details of the proceedings are without interest, but the fact of the revival of the regular Synodal action of the Romish Church throughout France, as well as in other countries, is worthy of notice.

*The Archbishop of Paris and the Press.*—The Archbishop of Paris has published a long *mandement* promulgating the decrees of the Council of Paris relative to the religious press. The decree prohibits all dis-

cussion of controverted points in the public prints, and requires them to be referred at once to the ecclesiastical authority. A supplementary document singles out the *Univers* in particular as an offender. The *Univers*, promising to conform in the interim to the Archbishop's sentence, has declared its intention to appeal direct to the Pope.

*The Education Question.*—A society has been formed by the Romish Bishops and Clergy in France, for the promotion of schools of all grades, and of educational publications, on the principles of the Romish Church, under the name of "*Comité de l'Enseignement libre.*" The Archbishops of Rheims and Tours, and the Bishops of Langres and Orléans, as well as Counts Molé and Montalembert, and M. de Vatismenil and others, are on the list of its supporters and managers.

*Decline of Protestantism.*—The *Semeur*, one of the principal organs of the French Protestants, has ceased to appear.

GERMANY.—*Re-organization of the Prussian Church.*—A new constitution has, with the Royal sanction, been promulgated for the Evangelic Church of Prussia. It recognizes the writings of the Old and New Testament as the Word of God, and the three principal symbols of the Reformation as the rule of faith. The government of the Church established by this constitution is of the most democratic character.

*Death of Dr. Neander.*—The celebrated Prussian divine, Dr. Augustus Neander, well known in this country through the translations of his Church history and other works, died at Berlin on the 14th instant, in his 62nd year. He was Upper Consistorial Councillor, and since 1813 Professor of Divinity at the University of Berlin, and one of the chief promoters of the changes operated in the Protestant Establishment of Prussia, and of the compromise of the Lutheran and Calvinistic confessions in the so-called United Church. Though opposed to the offensive rationalism of the "Friends of Light," he was himself one of the luminaries of the unsound school of theology which has superseded the ancient traditions of the Protestant communions of Germany.

*Progress of Rationalism.*—A United Synod of German Catholics and Free Congregationalists has recently been held at Leipzig,—and on being expelled thence, at Cöthen, where the police likewise interfered,—which, as far as the proceedings could be carried, ended in a fusion of those two rationalistic off-shoots of the Romish and Protestant communions of Germany into a "General religious Association of free Congregations." Several of the German Catholic congregations have, however, repudiated the acts of the late "Council."

*Scarcity of Priests.*—There is considerable difficulty experienced in Prussia, in recruiting the Popish Priesthood. At the beginning of this year no less than 862 cures were vacant, for want of Clergy to undertake them.

INDIA.—*The Church planted in Borneo.*—A Missionary Church, dedicated to St. Thomas, has been erected, with the consent of the entire population, at Sarâwak. The mission-house has likewise been

finished, and the school is in active operation. A home school has been formed, in which a number of orphan children, after receiving the holy rite of baptism, are educated as Christians, apart from native influence. A translation of the Church Catechism and of some of the prayers of our Liturgy has been made. The most encouraging view is given of the missionary prospects among the Dyaks by Mr. M'Dougall, an active missionary: "Our prospects of being able to lay the foundation of extensive missionary labours are increasing daily; nothing hinders now but want of labourers. Tribes upon tribes of Dyaks have asked me to send them teachers; some have even expressed their desire to become 'white men,'—meaning Christians,—at once, and wish me to baptize them at once; but until I have missionaries to place among them, and prepare them better, I do not dare to do so; for while I am alone, it would only arouse Mahomedan jealousy and suspicion, and in my absence the Malays would counteract all I might have effected; whereas if I had European clergymen or catechists to place among the tribes, they would effectually prevent all Malay intrigue or opposition, for when a European is present, the Malay has little or no influence over the Dyak."

*Increase of Romish Bishops.*—The Pope has issued "Apostolic Briefs" for the division of the Popish diocese of Bengal into two Vicarates of Eastern and Western Bengal.

*Character of Romish Missions.*—The writer of a series of interesting papers on the "Missions of the Church in Tinnevely," in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, makes the following statements respecting the character of Romish Missions, as the result of his own experience—

"During the many years that I have been acquainted with the missions in India, I have never heard of the Romanists doing any thing directly with a view to the conversion of the heathen. I believe it is many years since such conversions have taken place,—in the south, at least. They are ever eager to attack us and our people; and they compass sea and land to make one such proselyte; they watch around our missions, eager to weaken and counteract us, but of their labours among the heathen I know nothing.

"Those who are connected with them are suffered to remain—as far as my observation extended—in hopeless and helpless ignorance; and in the south, they have established scarcely a single school; they very seldom either preach or catechise, or use any other means for the instruction of their people. There are very few books in circulation among their congregations, except some against Protestantism. I never met a Romanist who had ever possessed any portion of the Holy Scriptures, except, indeed, he had obtained it from one of our missionaries.

"The worst features of Romanism are there the most prominently exhibited. Their churches are called, as far as I have observed, universally, by Christian and heathen, (without any idea of reproach,) "Máthá-Covil," i. e. "Mother-temples," and never Christian temples. It is understood universally among the heathen, that the Romanists worship images just as they do themselves. They appear to assimilate



themselves to the heathen as far as possible. The heathen, in fact, do not usually speak of them as Christians; and, in several tracts which they have published against Christianity, they have taken especial care to state that they wrote only against Protestants, since they only were the uncompromising opponents of idolatry and caste."

The writer adds:—"I have said all this unwillingly. I am not fond of attacking any 'who profess and call themselves Christians;' but when invidious comparisons are made between Romish and Anglican missions, by Romanist writers, I feel it my duty to bear testimony, as abundant opportunities of personal acquaintance with the subject enable me to do, to the far greater reality, earnestness, sobriety, and spirituality, in my opinion, of the work as conducted by the English Church in Southern India."

*ITALY.—Jubilee on the Pope's Restoration.*—The Pope has ordered the celebration of an universal jubilee, in commemoration of his restoration to his dominions. The time is to be fixed by the bishops themselves in different parts of the world. It is to last fifteen days, and to carry plenary indulgence of one hundred years for each separate accomplishment of the set of devotional exercises to be prescribed by the bishops in their several dioceses.

*Mariolatry.*—It is officially announced that "the sovereign pontiff, being desirous of giving to the most holy Virgin Mary a mark of his gratitude for the deliverance of Rome, rescued last year by the French troops from the enemies of the Church, on the day of the Visitation, has elevated that festival to the double rite of the second class."

*The Pope and the Dominicans.*—The Dominicans having assembled for the election of a general, the Pope put a stop to their proceedings, and nominated a general, Father Jeandel, a French Dominican. A general remodelling of the constitution of the monastic orders is expected, the Pope considering them too democratic.

*The Sardinian Government and the Pope.*—The Sardinian government is afresh, and as it would seem hopelessly, embroiled with the Pope. Whilst the government was following up its measures, in pursuance of the law Siccardi,—among others, the execution of a sentence against the Archbishop of Sassari, on account of the Pastoral issued by him, for which he was condemned to one month's imprisonment and 500*f.* fine,—an event occurred which caused the flame of discord between the Archbishop of Turin and the government to break out anew. The archbishop had completed his term of imprisonment, and was again at liberty, when M. De Santa Rosa, one of the members of the cabinet, was attacked by a mortal illness. On its being intimated by the medical attendant of M. De Santa Rosa that his dissolution was approaching, the family sent to the priest of San Carlo, to request the administration of the last sacraments. After considerable delay and evasion, the priest confessed that he was prohibited by the archbishop from affording to the minister the last consolations of religion, except on condition of his disavowing all participation in the obnoxious law Siccardi, or else express-

ing his regret for it; neither of which M. De Santa Rosa was willing to do. The king, on learning the circumstance, sent the minister of war to remonstrate with the archbishop. The reply was, that not only the last offices of the Church, but the rites of Christian burial, should be denied to the minister, for his participation in the recent measures of the Sardinian government. The latter menace was subsequently withdrawn, but the denial of the dying offices was persisted in, and M. De Santa Rosa expired, protesting that if he had erred, his error was one of judgment. The religious obsequies took place on the 7th. The archbishop was arrested by order of the government, and consigned to the fortress of Fenestrelles. The archbishop had, previous to his arrest, the option proposed him of resigning his see, which he refused. The papers found in his palace were seized, and are said to be of the most compromising character. It is a curious coincidence, that on the day preceding his arrest, the subscription cross, that worn by Mgr. Affre on the day of his death on the barricades, was presented to the archbishop by one of the editors of the journal (the *Univers*) with which the subscription originated. The occurrence created a great sensation at Turin, and the priests were the objects of insult and violence at the hands of the mob. So great was the exasperation of the people, that it became necessary to remove the monks of the order of *Servi*, who had the charge of the parish of San Carlo, and to supply their places by secular priests. The monks surrendered all their property, excepting portable values, which they took with them, under protest, and were marched off under an escort, for their own safety, of national guards. Meanwhile the Sardinian government thought it prudent, after the arrest of the archbishop, who has ever since been kept in close confinement, to send a special envoy to Rome, to explain the circumstances of the case. The envoy, Signor Pinelli, lost no time, on his arrival, in soliciting the favour of an interview with the Pope, upon which Cardinal Antonelli sent him a note to the following effect :—

“The Holy Father will gladly receive Commander Pinelli as a private individual, as he indistinctly receives all the faithful; but as an Envoy from the Sardinian Government he cannot receive him, until the Venerable Archbishop of Turin shall have been set at liberty.”

Immediately on receiving this communication, Signor Pinelli despatched a courier to Turin, and was on the point of quitting Rome, when, according to a letter published by the *Constitutionnel*, he was informed that the Pope consented to grant him an audience, without, however, recognizing him in his official capacity. The following account is given by the writer of the reception which took place in presence of witnesses :—

“M. Pinelli developed and advocated before the Holy Father the principle invoked by M. d’Azeglio in all his diplomatic notes; that is, the right of Piedmont to change her own laws, which, as Sardinian subjects, the members of the clergy were bound to obey. The Pontifical Government placed the question on another ground. It demanded the execution of treaties concluded by Piedmont with the Holy See,

and contended that the Sardinian Cabinet should have commenced by applying to the Court of Rome, and made the suppression of the ecclesiastical immunities the object of a negotiation tending to modify the Concordat signed in April, and which guaranteed those immunities. The Pope then told M. Pinelli, that when Piedmont should have liberated the Archbishop of Turin, and re-established the *status quo* existing previously to the promulgation of the Siccardi law; its Government might then, if it thought proper, open negotiations with the Court of Rome to obtain modifications in that Concordat."

While the Sardinian envoy was thus endeavouring in vain to bring about an accommodation of the difficulties arising out of the case of the Archbishop of Turin, another *imbroglio* supervened, in the form of a quarrel between the Piedmontese Government and the Archbishop of Cagliari, which is likely to render a reconciliation with Rome more difficult than ever. Some time ago the Piedmontese Government named a commission to inquire into the revenues of the dioceses and Churches of the kingdom. The commission having addressed a circular to all the Prelates of the island of Sardinia, inviting them to send in statements of their revenues, all the Bishops complied with the request, with the exception of the Archbishop of Cagliari, who refused, on the ground that the King's Government had no right to institute such an inquiry, and published a monitory circular, dated Nov. 13, 1849, threatening with the penalty of excommunication those who should aid in compelling him to furnish the required information. The Siccardi law not being in existence at that time, the authorities were unable to take any steps against the archbishop on that occasion. Meanwhile, however, a religious institution, *La Contadoria*, had not yet been examined, and the commission again addressed a letter to the archbishop, desiring him to give information. On his refusal, the tribunal ordered the papers and books of *La Contadoria* to be sealed up; but when, on the 5th inst., the Judge proceeded to the door of *La Contadoria*, which is situated within the precincts of the Archiepiscopal palace, he found there an excommunication against the authors and abettors of the "usurpation," written in the Archbishop's own hand, and ending thus:—"Given from our violated domicile, Sept. 4, 1850. Emmanuel, Archbishop." The Judge immediately caused this document to be taken down and transmitted to the public prosecutor, who commenced legal proceedings against the Prelate without delay. Here the matter rests for the present.

*A false Christ.*—A priest, named Don Grignaschi, has been passing himself off in Piedmont as Jesus Christ, or some Great One, and by the evidence of false miracles beguiled many persons. He has been tried and sentenced to ten years' exile, and five other priests and several lay accomplices besides him have been condemned to various punishments.

*New See in Tuscany.*—A new Bishopric has been created, by a Papal Bull, in Tuscany, with Modigliana for its see.

*Return of the Jesuits.*—A decree of the Duke of Modena recalls the



Jesuits, and confides to them the schools of Modena, Reggio, and Mazza.

*An Italo-Catholic Schism.*—A schismatic communion, professing the principles of Ronge, has been formed at Verona under the leadership of a mercantile clerk.

MADEIRA.—*The Bishop of Bombay and the Rev. R. T. Lowe.*—The Rev. R. T. Lowe having transmitted to his diocesan, the Bishop of London, an account of the circumstances connected with the visit of the Bishop of Bombay to the island, of which we gave an account in our last number, together with the documents which passed on the occasion, his lordship has, in reply, addressed to Mr. Lowe the following letter :

“ London, June 13, 1850.

“ My dear Sir,—I have received your letter with its enclosures, and also one from the Bishop of Bombay, containing a copy of the correspondence which has passed between his lordship and you, together with a statement of facts.

“ I cannot say how much pain has been occasioned to me by the perusal of these documents, nor how deeply I regret what has taken place. With every wish to uphold your just authority, and making every allowance for the peculiar circumstances in which you are placed, I can by no means approve of the line of conduct you have pursued towards that excellent and much respected prelate. I had entertained a hope that, under his kind and judicious advice, some step might be taken towards healing the unhappy difference in Church matters which prevails at Madeira.

“ In a conversation I had with the Bishop just before he left England, I expressed this hope to him. I stated that, as you continued to hold my licence, the revocation of which you had done nothing to justify, I could not require any other clergyman, as authorized by me, to officiate in Madeira; but I certainly did not speak of Mr. Brown, nor of his congregation, as being in a state of schism; nor do I consider them to be so. I have no *legal* jurisdiction over them. It has long been held that English Clergymen in our colonies and in foreign parts, not being under the jurisdiction of any local diocesan, were under that of the Bishop of London; but I am not prepared to assent that the non-recognition of that jurisdiction amounts to an act of schism. There are, or have been, not a few clergymen ministering to English congregations on the Continent, who have never acknowledged my episcopal authority over them, nor received my licence; but, although I think they are acting inconsistently with true Church principles, I never held them to be schismatics, nor have I made any difficulty about admitting their catechumens to confirmation. If, therefore, you had made the same charge of schismatical conduct against a private member of the Church as you have made against the Bishop of Bombay, and had threatened on that ground to repel him from the Holy Communion, I should have felt myself bound, if appealed to, to express my disapproval of such a

proceeding ; but it is, as it appears to me, a much more serious matter to treat a Bishop of our own Church as an abettor of schism, and to admonish him as such not to present himself as a communicant. It was known to you that the Bishop of Bombay had been commissioned by me to administer the rite of confirmation to such young persons at Madeira as might be desirous of receiving it. Surely, then, it was your duty, if you felt any doubt as to the propriety of admitting him to the Holy Communion, to refer the matter to me ; and, in the mean time, to treat him as your spiritual superior on the spot with respect and deference.

“ I most earnestly press upon you the duty of making a proper apology to the Bishop on this account ; and you cannot, I think, be surprised if I feel that I, too, have been placed in a painful and embarrassing position by this stretch of ecclesiastical authority on your part, while acting under my licence.

“ The publicity which has been given to the proceeding in question makes it my duty to send a copy of this letter to the Bishop of Bombay, to be made such use of as he may think proper.

“ I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

“ C. J. LONDON.

“ The Rev. R. T. Lowe.”

NEW ZEALAND.—*Visitation of the islands of New Caledonia.*—The *Colonial Church Chronicle* has an account of the recent movements of the Bishop of New Zealand. On the 1st of October his lordship returned in the “Undine,” schooner, from a short cruise amongst the islands in the neighbourhood of New Caledonia. The Bishop visited ten of these interesting islands, and was every where received by the natives in the most friendly manner. He brought with him five young lads to spend the summer in New Zealand, and then return to their own country. Of these, one is a native of Lifu, another of New Caledonia, and the other three come from the island of Mare. In each of these places an entirely different language is spoken, and this, notwithstanding the fact that Lifu and Mare are within sight of each other, and are islands of very small size. The lads are now residing at St. John’s College, and each of their three languages being committed to the charge of separate members of the college, a copious vocabulary will, it is hoped, be formed of all of them during the ensuing summer.

SWITZERLAND.—*M. Marilley.*—M. Marilley, the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, has addressed, from his exile, a letter to the clergy of his diocese, in which he warns them against the encroachments of the secular power, and prohibits them from acting in ecclesiastical matters without the express authority of their ecclesiastical superior, and from accepting any mission for the performance of their sacerdotal functions from the State.

UNITED STATES.—*Diocesan Convocations.*—The following is an account of the more interesting transactions of the Conventions of the American Church, recently held :

*Diocese of Maryland.*—The Convention had to deal with the following singular case of Church discipline. It appears that, in March last, the Bishop sent a letter to the Rector of Christ Church, Dr. Johns, setting forth that he (the Bishop) had not received any invitation from the Rector to visit his church, and as three years had elapsed since his last episcopal visit, in accordance with the canons of the Church, he notified the Rector that he would, on a certain Sunday, visit Christ Church, for the purpose of examining into the affairs of the same, performing Divine Service, preaching, and confirming such persons as might be presented ; and farther, that he should expect to administer the Holy Communion—the collection at the offertory to be for the Diocesan Board of Missions. To this letter the Rector of Christ Church sent one in reply, saying, that while he would be happy to have the Bishop visit his church, and administer the rite of Confirmation, he felt bound to deny his right to administer the Communion, and appropriate the offertory to the funds of the Diocesan Board of Missions, on the ground that the Bishop had no warrant for so doing, either by the general canons or in the rubrics of the Church, and that such an exercise of power would be in conflict with his rights as a presbyter of the Church. With regard to that portion of the Bishop's letter complaining that he had not been invited to visit Christ Church, Dr. Johns replied that, inasmuch as one of the canons made it the duty of the Bishop to visit every church in his diocese at least once in three years, he had deemed it his duty to await the pleasure of the Bishop. The Bishop, in answer to this letter, notified the Rev. Dr. Johns, that, inasmuch as his right to administer the Communion had been denied, he therefore revoked his notice to visit Christ Church. A letter was also read from the vestry of Christ Church, informing the Bishop of their intention to lay the whole matter before three Bishops of the Church for investigation, according to the canons of the Church. The letter in question was also put in. It was addressed to the Bishops of Massachusetts, Delaware, and Pennsylvania, and set forth the circumstances of the case, charging the Bishop of Maryland with having expressly violated the general canon of 1832, in not visiting Christ Church for a period of three years, to the great detriment of the congregation, depriving a large number of candidates for confirmation of an opportunity to receive that holy rite. To this letter no answer had been received from the Bishops to whom it was addressed. Dr. Johns deprecated the impression which had gone abroad, that his action had been somewhat discourteous to the Bishop. This was not so. The Bishop, from his sense of duty, pursued a course which he (Dr. Johns), also from a sense of duty, had felt constrained to oppose ; all that had been done was with the simple view of having the matter settled, so that all difficulty might in future be avoided. The matter was finally decided by the



Convention adopting the following three resolutions:—"1. That a Bishop, in order to the exercise of his episcopal functions, possesses the right on occasions of canonical visitations to control the services, and to take to himself portions of them as he may think proper. 2. That this principle was recognized and settled as the law of the diocese of Maryland by the decision of the tribunal which the law of the diocese had constituted for the decision of ecclesiastical questions, and from the decisions of which tribunal no law of the Church recognized any appeal. 3. That the course of the Bishop of this diocese, in revoking his notice of a visitation to Christ Church, Baltimore, was the wise and judicious exercise of a discretion canonically vested in him, in a spirit of Christian prudence and forbearance which does him honour."

*Diocese of Mississippi.*—Among the most important matters transacted at this Convention was the organization of a society, in subordination to the Church, for the diffusion of Christian knowledge in the Diocese, embracing a well-digested plan of domestic missionary operations, together with the distribution of Bibles, Prayer Books, tracts, and other approved religious publications; a system of convocations or meetings of the Bishop and a portion of his clergy in different parts of the Diocese several times in each year; and the foundation for the establishment of a permanent interest-bearing fund for the support of the Bishop.

*Diocese of North Carolina.*—More than usual interest attached to the proceedings of this Convention, owing to reports which had been widely disseminated, that the Bishop was tainted with unsound doctrine. On the evening before the day appointed for the meeting of the Convention, the greater part of the Presbyters of the Diocese, in accordance with a previous call received from him, met their Bishop in Convocation, for the purpose of consulting on the means best adapted for restoring harmony and good will throughout the Diocese. At the conclusion of a long session, in which the greatest freedom of discussion was allowed, a committee of seven Presbyters was elected by ballot to confer with the Bishop on this most important subject. Upon the re-assembling of the Convocation on the following day, this Committee reported that it was the intention of the Bishop, in pursuance of their advice, to make such statements in his usual annual address to the Convention, as would tend to remove the existing anxieties of the Diocese. Accordingly, in his address to the Convention on Thursday, the Bishop adverted to the causes of disquietude which had been brought to his notice, denying explicitly the false doctrines that had been imputed to him, and directly and distinctly declaring his adhesion to the truth of Christ's doctrine as laid down in the standards of the Church. The portion of the Bishop's address which related to this subject was to the following effect:—

"It remains to notice one of my official acts during the present year, which has been the occasion of a good deal of misapprehension, and which requires of me a few words by way of safeguard. I refer to the issuing of a Pastoral letter relating to the action of the last Convention

of this Diocese. Without going into a defence of the grounds which seemed to me to make the publication of that letter necessary, I would express my deep regret, that any of the statements should in any degree have admitted the idea of an intention on my part to question the motives, the truthfulness, or faith of my Clergy. Notwithstanding the circumstances which under Providence have given the appearance of distrust between some of the most valued of them and myself for a time, I desire now to assure them as a body, of my entire confidence in their affection, their charity, and firm adherence to the faith, and discipline of the Church. I have laboured among them for nearly twenty years, I know very imperfectly, but with a sincere desire for the good of my diocese, and I believe with unwavering fidelity to my trust. Still I claim no infallibility beyond honesty of purpose and diligence in duty, and no indulgence beyond that which is extended to every man labouring under the infirmity of a human judgment, and the oft recurring and sometimes prostrating diseases of a human body. For myself as an individual, I have nothing to urge—nothing to say.—But as your Bishop, responsible in some sort at least for the truth, I feel bound to remove in terms of plain denial some misconceptions, which are operating to hinder the due effects of that truth, as set forth in my writings, and to keep up agitation and distrust in the Diocese. I neither teach nor hold, as some have thought, private auricular confession and absolution in the Romish sense. The Romish Church holds them to be a necessary sacrament in themselves, as is Baptism and the Lord's Supper. I hold and teach that our branch of the Church denies this. That Church makes them obligatory on all her members—I teach and hold that our Church does not—but makes them an exception to a general rule—which general rule is public confession and absolution according to the forms in our Liturgy. That Church obliges the Priest to see, that every communicant comes to them. I teach and hold that our Church leaves it with the penitent to determine whether and how far he need them, and does not permit the Priest to do more in bringing the penitent to them, than to point out the dangers of self-trust and self-delusion, and the benefits of unburdening the conscience and receiving the Godly counsel and service of God's ministers, according to the direction of the exhortation to the Holy Communion in our Liturgy. That Church holds to the necessity of confessing each mortal sin of thought, word, and deed to the Priest. I teach and hold that our Church regards it needful, that each communicant should so search and examine his conscience according to the rule of God's commandments, as to be able to confess all heinous offences 'in will, word, and deed,' to Almighty God; and that if he cannot by this means quiet his conscience, and come to the Holy Communion 'with a full trust in God's mercy,' he shall open his grief to some minister of God's word, that he may obtain his counsel and aid, to the removing of all scruple and doubtfulness.

“ In regard to Christ's real presence in the Holy Eucharist, I neither teach nor hold it, in the sense of *transubstantiation*; neither do I teach

nor hold, as I do not understand how Christ is there present—further than that, He is not there in a material but spiritual manner—‘but because *spiritual*, not the less *real*.’ I do not hold or teach that ‘the creatures of bread and wine’ in the Holy Eucharist are to be in the meaning of the Twenty-eighth Article, ‘reserved, carried about, lifted up, or even worshipped.’

“I do not teach or hold, that our Church allows any addresses, by way of prayer and invocation to the blessed Virgin, or to any Saint or Angel; while I regard the Romish doctrine of invocation to Saints, implying meritorious mediation and condemned by Article XXXII., as clearly derogatory to Christ, and opposed to God’s word.

“Finally, I do not teach nor hold that our branch of the Catholic Church is from any cause either in heresy or schism, or that she is destitute of the true Sacramental system. This much have I thought it best to say *negatively*, to guard my affirmative teaching from misconstruction and misapprehension. That teaching is before you, in my published writings, with such explanations as I have felt myself called upon to give. Whatever may be the imperfections of the teacher (and he feels that they are many), for the returns made to him for his sincere, and he believes greatly needed efforts, he has the satisfaction of a firm conviction, and the privilege of constant prayer, that Almighty God will so overrule those efforts, as to make them redound to his glory and the good of his Church.”

This explanation was received with great satisfaction by the great body of the Convention; but as it was feared that some further action would be necessary to a perfect restoration of peace, the Bishop on the following morning addressed the Convention as follows:—

“Brethren of this Convention,—Aware that the difficulties in this Diocese, to which I have alluded in my address, still threaten the peace of the same, and being anxious to do all in my power to restore perfect harmony and good will, I hereby ask of you a committee of clergymen and laymen to investigate the whole circumstances connected therewith, and report to a future meeting of this body.”

Upon this the Convention resolved to accede to the request of the Bishop, by the election of a committee for the purpose specified by him, to consist of three clergymen and three laymen, whose duty it should be to report the result of their labours to the next annual Convention of the Diocese, to be held in May, 1851. The Committee on the State of the Church, in the usual annual report, alluded to these proceedings in the following terms:—

“The Committee have heard and read with great satisfaction, that portion of the Bishop’s address which contains the explanation of doctrines taught, in his published writings, stating that ‘he feels bound to remove, in terms of denial, some misapprehensions, which are operating to hinder the due effects of that truth, as set forth in his writings;’ and they trust that these explanations will tend to remove the agitation and distrust of which the Bishop speaks, and have the same effect upon the Church throughout the Diocese, which they have had upon



the minds of the Committee, of inducing the hope, that the peace and harmony, for which this diocese was formerly distinguished, may be restored. The Committee must not omit to express the gratification with which they have received the expression contained in the Bishop's address, of his entire confidence in the affection of the Clergy, and their firm adherence to the faith and discipline of the Church."

*Diocese of Kentucky.*—The striking features of this Convention was the charge of the Bishop, which the *Episcopal Recorder* describes as "decided in its tone, Scriptural and Evangelical in its doctrine, and, in the opinion of several who heard it, by far the best that has yet been written against the prevailing error of the day." The effect which it produced upon the Convention may be inferred from the fact that when, in the regular course of business, the election of delegates to the General Convention was proposed, one of the Clergy moved the postponement of all elections until the morrow, inasmuch as too much excitement prevailed among the members of the Convention to allow of their acting coolly and dispassionately. After a warm and animated discussion, the motion was carried, and the Convention adjourned. The result of the election was considered favourable to the "friends of evangelical truth."

*Diocese of Indiana.*—At this Convention an instance of the exercise of Church discipline occurred. The Bishop informed the Convention that he had approved of the sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, in the case of the Rev. G. Lamb Roberts, who had been found guilty of heresy, schism, slander, and a violation of his ordination vows. The sentence of the Court was, that he should be degraded from his office as a Deacon of the Church. And the Bishop further declared that he had, in the presence of the Clergy of the Diocese, pronounced the sentence of degradation, and the Rev. G. Lamb Roberts was no longer a Minister of this Church.

*Diocese of Michigan.*—In this diocese, which, in common with other western dioceses, most keenly feels the loss occasioned by the withdrawal of the larger part of the appropriation heretofore made by the Domestic Board of Missions, the Convention passed a resolution requiring every Clergyman having parochial charge within the Diocese, on the second Sunday of each month, to read the offertory to his congregation, and take up a collection for missions.

*Diocese of Texas.*—The present was the first Convention of this newly-formed Diocese. Six clergymen were present from the parishes of Galveston, Houston, Matagorda, Brazoria, Washington, and San Augustine; lay representatives arrived from three parishes, presented their certificates, and took their seats in the Convention. The attention of the Convention was chiefly engaged in the consideration of two suggestions submitted by the Bishop. One was the appointment of a general missionary, who should travel over the State at large, visiting those places which were not favoured with the service of the Church, gathering her scattered members into parishes, and comforting them by the assurance, that at the earliest opportunity they shall have

the services of those who minister in holy things. The other topic, suggested by the Bishop, was the necessity of establishing some where within the bounds of the Diocese a Church Seminary, where the devoted members of the Church might send their children with the confidence that they would receive a thorough classic education, under the most competent teachers, and be properly instructed in the peculiar principles of the Church—those teachers being clergymen—but the grand object of the school to be the training of young men for the work of the ministry. Both these suggestions, particularly the last, met with the hearty concurrence of the Convention. A committee was appointed to carry the proposal for a school into effect at as early a period as practicable. Within the last two years, the number of the clergy in Texas has been nearly tripled, and the members of organized parishes has increased from *three* to *ten*. In every place where the Church has been established, the prospects are cheering and encouraging. Application for clergymen are received from all parts of the State; and with a sufficient supply of clergy, the number of parishes might be doubled in less than twelve months.

*Diocese of Wisconsin.*—This diocese is yet in its infancy, this being the fourth Convention. The Bishop in his address urged the increase of the Diocesan Missionary Fund, so as to support two additional itinerants. He also announced a plan, not yet matured in detail, for the establishment of a College or Church School. A committee was appointed to organize a subscription to increase the episcopal fund of the diocese. The constitution of the Convention itself underwent some modifications. The first of them is, that “every clergyman canonically connected with the diocese, and having charge of some parish (or officiating as a Missionary within its bounds, or having spiritual charge, as president, professor, tutor, or instructor in some college, academy, or seminary of learning, constituted or countenanced by ecclesiastical authority, or being a Chaplain in the Navy or Army of the United States), shall be entitled to a seat in this Convention. In every case, however, where a clergyman is not able to hold a cure of souls, arising from bodily infirmity, or age, he shall not for such cause be excluded from a seat in this Convention.” With regard to the qualification of the lay-members, it was proposed, but decided in the negative, that “the lay-members of the Convention shall be either communicants of the Protestant Episcopal Church, or shall have been baptized by the office and ministry of the same.” A canon was adopted for insuring ritual uniformity. It provides that questions of ritual and liturgical practice, ecclesiastical arrangements, &c., left open by the statute law of the American Church, are to be decided for this diocese by the Bishop and his council, the clerical members of the standing committee, acting judicially, when occasions arise; such judicial decision to be obeyed as the common law of the Church in this diocese, under liability to the usual penalties.

*Diocese of Missouri.*—A canon was adopted requiring the appointment of a committee to make an assessment upon the parishes for the

support of the episcopate. Such assessment was made, and although it is not expected in the present infant state of most of the parishes to yield much more than is needful to defray the travelling expenses of the Bishop, it is nevertheless wisely adapted to secure a revenue commensurate with the growth of the diocese for the important object in view.

*Diocese of Tennessee.*—In the address of the Bishop, the following passage occurs:—"Some portions of the Church have been much disturbed by questions which have been raised about doctrine and discipline. This diocese has hitherto been most happily preserved from these agitations, and I gladly avail myself of this occasion to say that we shall, by God's blessing, be kept in peace among ourselves, if the clergy will, as heretofore they have done, with scarcely an exception, adhere faithfully to 'the form of sound words' set forth by the authority of the Church, for use in the public worship of our congregations, and in the administration of the sacraments and other rites of the Church. The great doctrines of religion, about which there is almost universal agreement among intelligent Christians, are therein set forth, with so much admirable simplicity and plainness, that it seems to me that the mind which raises questions about the teaching of the Church, must be obstinately bent upon making difficulties."

*Diocese of Virginia.*—A stringent canon on Church discipline was passed by this Convention, which enumerates "gaming, attendance on horse-racing, and theatrical amusements, witnessing immodest and licentious exhibitions or shows," and "attending public balls," among "offences for which discipline should be exercised," with a general clause against "conducting one's self in a manner unworthy of a Christian." The canon in question has excited much attention, and provoked much comment in the Union generally, as tending to confusion by the establishment of arbitrary terms of communion.

*Foreign Missions of the American Churches.*—The annual meeting of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States was held at Hartford, on the 19th of June. In their Report the Committee state, that "notwithstanding some trials, the Missions of the Church under their care are, in general, acquiring stability, and that they have been visited with the Divine blessing in their operations during the year." On the subject of finance, which has of late been so unsatisfactory, the report contains the pleasing assurance, that "although the receipts of the past year have not equalled those of the two preceding, in consequence of some extraordinary specific benefactions made during the latter, yet the contributions from usual sources have been sufficient to prevent embarrassment, and have enabled the Committee to make remittances to their Missionaries with a good measure of promptitude." The report complains, however, that to the appeal made, as usual, at the Epiphany season, by way of collection, "the response was less general and less liberal than on former occasions." The aggregate of the receipts for the year are stated at 34,800 dols. 79 c.: the expenditure at 32,404 dols. 17 c. A particularly interesting account is given of the African mission, which



requires the speedy appointment of a Bishop to carry out the important designs of the missionaries. The China mission is reported as suffering chiefly for want of labourers, male and female. A native (Chae) has been ordained deacon. The subject which excites the deepest interest is a projected mission among the Chickasaw Indians, arising from a request of the Indians themselves, through the United States Government, for the establishment among them of schools, &c., under the charge of the Episcopal Church. At the close, an informal debate took place upon the Constantinople mission, during which Bishop Southgate himself addressed the Board. The meeting came, however, to no conclusion upon this subject, and was adjourned *sine die*.

*The Theological College, New York.*—The annual meeting of the Trustees of this College took place on the 26th of June, and the commencement on the 27th. The occasion derived more than ordinary interest by the retirement, on the ground of old age, of Dr. Wilson, Professor of Systematic Divinity, and Dr. Moore, Professor of Oriental and Greek literature, who had both grown grey in the service of the College. The students presented each of the professors with a splendid Bible and Prayer Book, in costly bindings: and in memorial of them they presented, for the use of the chapel of the seminary, a handsome silver chalice and patine, from which the Bishop of Vermont immediately after administered the Holy Eucharist to the clergy, professors, students, and visitors collected on the occasion. The scene was most affecting, and many of those present were moved to tears.

*Church History Society.*—A "Protestant Episcopal Historical Society" has been established at Hartford, in the diocese of Connecticut, for the purpose of collecting, preserving, and publishing documents which throw light on the progress of the American branch of the Church. Churchmen paying two dollars annually are to be entitled to all publications. But the scope and the mode of its operations are explained in the address of the "Executive Committee," in which they say—

"The importance of securing a complete collection of historical materials, relating to the Protestant Episcopal Church, is so generally felt, that the members of this Committee do not presume that they can suggest any thing new to their brethren of the clergy and laity upon that subject. But as a number of the bishops, other clergy, and laity have associated in a Church Historical Society, and laid upon this Committee the honour and labour of furthering its objects, they venture to propose some plans for that purpose, asking co-operation from all who are interested in the subject, or in other words, from every member of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"Their first duty is to make a complete collection of the historical materials now in existence. In order to do this they earnestly desire every clergyman and layman in the Church to transmit to the Secretary *a duly-attested copy* of every curious, valuable, or interesting entry in parish books or private papers, to which they can obtain access, or where it is possible, the originals themselves; and also note down and transmit any historical traditions which may come under their notice.

"If persons will prepare manuscript histories of parishes, or of any particular events, this Committee will be happy to take charge of them, subject to any directions respecting the time of opening which their contributors may see fit to make; *all facts, however, to be duly attested as to the source from whence derived.* This Committee will also be glad to receive any publications, old or new, which contain historical matters of fact, opinion, or controversy, bearing upon ecclesiastical history in America.

"A fire-proof depository will be obtained as soon as possible, the plan and details of which will be made known, when special subscriptions are solicited for that purpose.

"So soon as the catalogue of members contains the names of five hundred persons who have paid their subscriptions, this Committee will prepare and put forth the first volume of the Society's publications, of which each member will receive a copy, and will continue to publish from time to time, as the means of the Society will permit. It is, however, their fixed determination, that no liabilities shall be incurred until the money to meet them is in the hands of the Treasurer.

"This Committee designs to keep a chronicle of passing events, and will therefore be obliged to the publishers of the Church periodicals, if they will regularly send their papers to the Secretary. To the same end they will appoint, as fast as practicable, corresponding members in every diocese, whose duty it will be to collect diocesan historical materials, past and current, and forward them to the Secretary."

*Schism among the Romanists.*—A meeting has recently been held at Philadelphia, composed chiefly of Germans, having for its object the establishment of a "Free Catholic Church" in the United States. The reasons assigned for the secession are:—"First, Freedom of conscience. Second, Because we and our children are deprived of the Holy Bible. Third, We cannot recognize the Pope as the infallible head of the Church, or Vicar of Christ. Fourth, We do reject, that the Priests through their ordination receive power to rule over God's inheritance, to traffic in souls, enslave conscience, and stupify the mind with superstition. Fifth, We reject celibacy. Sixth, We reject auricular confession as unrighteous and demoralizing. Seventh, We reject purgatory. Eighth, We reject calling on the saints, veneration of images and relics. Ninth, We reject indulgences and pilgrimages, and making merchandize of men's souls." One of the leading speakers was Mr. Gustiani, formerly a Roman Catholic Priest, who has been for some time a Minister of the Methodist Church, Philadelphia. It remains to be proved whether the American "Free Catholics" are identical or not with the followers of Ronge in Germany.

---

# THE ENGLISH REVIEW.

---

DECEMBER, 1850.

---

ART. I.—*Lives of the Queens of Scotland and English Princesses, connected with the Royal Succession of Great Britain.* By AGNES STRICKLAND. Vol. I. London and Edinburgh: Blackwood and Sons.

THE author of *Waverley* was the first writer who, in our own times, invested history with the many-coloured hues of romance, and gave to fiction the force of reality, by identifying it with the events and manners of past ages. And many a labourer in the same fruitful field has followed;—so many, indeed, and with such various success, that we have become familiarized with almost every conceivable way and mode of connecting fiction with history. We are prepared for the descriptions of scenery, the costumes, and even the principal characters, before we open the new romance. The language, manners, and incidents of the tale may be guessed with tolerable accuracy. The cavalier and the round-head—the crusader and the priest—the outlaw's den, and the rude hospitality of the hostelry—the mimic war of the tournament, and the deadly onslaught of pitched battles,—are all as familiar to us now as household words; and we are unable to revive those sensations which were excited by the first efforts of that great writer who called up the imagery of the past, and gave to it life and action in his immortal pages.

Miss Strickland has, we think, learnt from Sir Walter Scott the charm by which he elevated romance to the dignity of history; but she has reversed the process: she has given to history the interest of romance. This may partly be ascribed to the subjects she has chosen: but chiefly to her mode of treating them; for, in her hands, the dry record of the chronicle, the long-forgotten ballad, or the rude song, the most petty detail of antiquarian curiosity, however apparently useless; the local legend, the old proverb, or the family relic and its history; the dusty and time-worn picture; the tottering ruin, or the genealogy of an ancient family,—all furnish forth a mass of materials, which, when fashioned and arranged, and intermingled with a thousand thoughts and reasonings, linking them together in a strange harmony, come forth at length in the wonderfully brilliant and life-like portraiture which the biographies of Miss Strickland invariably produce—those rich mosaics of infinitely varied colours, the



materials of which, each, in itself, are perhaps of comparatively little interest, but, in their combination, present a masterpiece of art.

It is this reality and vividness which constitutes the great value of Miss Strickland's writings. In a merely historical view, we think they are rendered less valuable by the very presence of the attributes which confer on them their highest interest. Miss Strickland is essentially a poetess; her imaginative faculties are extraordinary, and the commonest event or circumstance is sufficient, to set them to work; and, when she has formed her idea of a character, she follows it out without stop or stay. Having been once unfavourably impressed, she has no mercy on the characters of her unfortunate subjects. A strong Jacobite, she cannot see any worth or merit in the sovereigns or statesmen of the opposite party. Their actions are always interpreted in the worst possible sense, and she appears throughout as a strong and ardent partizan. We have no doubt that Miss Strickland is sincerely convinced of the truth of her views; but the force of her imagination, and the prejudices which she sometimes betrays in consequence, while they add greatly to—nay constitute the especial interest of her volumes—detract from their value and trustworthiness, considered simply as historical compositions. They are brilliant historical romances, approaching as near to fact as the imaginative faculties of their gifted authoress will permit.

In the volume before us, which constitutes the first of a series of *Lives of the Queens of Scotland*, Miss Strickland has not only been fortunate in the selection of her subject, but she has sustained to the full the high reputation for research which her previous writings have acquired. Her choice has indeed been evidently directed to that period when Scottish history assumes the highest interest, and connects itself most closely with the sympathies of the present day. Every one must be curious to peruse Miss Strickland's *Life of Mary Stuart*, while every one can anticipate the verdict she will pronounce; and, in fact, it appears, that the present work is all intended to converge on that unhappy queen as its central and leading point. The general design of the work is thus described in the *Introductory Preface*:

“The lives of the Queens of Scotland, in the modern series which I have the honour of introducing in the present volume, commence with Margaret Tudor, the consort of James IV. of Scotland, and daughter of Henry VII. of England and Elizabeth of York. Margaret Tudor, like her illustrious predecessor and ancestress, Margaret Atheling, was an English princess in the direct line of the regal succession of that realm, and a queen-consort of Scotland. Her posterity by James IV. united the blood of the elder line of the Anglo-Saxon kings and the Norman Conqueror, blended with that of Bruce-Stuart and Planta-

genet-Tudor in one rich stream. James VI. of Scotland, doubly her great-grandson, inherited the realms of England and Ireland, as the representative of that princess, whose hereditary rights are now vested in her august descendant, Queen Victoria.

"The Life of Mary Stuart, which will occupy two successive volumes of this series, was in preparation long before the publication of that of Elizabeth Tudor, in our *Lives of the Queens of England*; when it was promised as a companion biography, but a separate work.

"Inexorably as the destiny of Mary Stuart was influenced by Elizabeth of England, no one could mix the personal annals of those rival Britannic sovereigns together, without producing, as Camden has done, great confusion, and impairing the interest attached to both, by violating the individual unity essential to biography; for they were stars shining in different orbits, and never visible in the same hemisphere. Their lives ought, however, to be read in succession, because they cast reflected lights upon each other, and are calculated, like the contemporary biographies in both series, to illustrate the comparative state of society in the sister realms.

"My pledge to the public, touching the Life of Mary Stuart, could not be redeemed till after the arduous undertaking in which my sister and myself were engaged was concluded. The accomplishment of that task occupied several years, in the course of which, fresh sources of information connected with the personal history of Mary have been opened both in France and England. So numerous, however, are the works on this subject, of ever fresh and undying interest, that although not one of them has been written since the publication of Prince Labanoff's seven volumes of his letters, and La Mothe Fénélon's despatches, we determined not to infringe on the pre-occupied ground and literary property of other authors, by bringing out a new Life of Mary Stuart in three volumes singly, but resolved, proceeding on our own original track, to introduce it into a new series of royal biographies on the same plan as *The Lives of the Queens of England*. The biography of Mary will, of course, be rendered more perspicuous and intelligible by being preceded by those of the three queens in the present volume, and followed by that of her aunt, Margaret, Countess of Lennox, the mother of the unfortunate Darnley, which is full of curious information, bearing on the much-contested point of the guilt or innocence of Mary.

"The selfish and short-sighted policy of Margaret Tudor, while exercising the functions of queen regent for her son James V., her intrigues with England, the interminable embroilments caused by her marriages and divorces, sowed, as will be shown, the perilous seeds of which her unfortunate descendants, Mary Stuart and Darnley, were destined to reap the bitter harvest.

"The life of James the Fifth's first consort, Magdalene of France, having important connexion with political relations, but no entanglement with political intrigues, comes like a refreshing interlude of sweet and pleasant things between the turmoils and agitations detailed in the

more eventful histories of Margaret Tudor and Mary of Lorraine. It is, in sooth, a romantic but carefully verified love-tale of royal romance, blended with the splendid pageantry and costume of the brilliant courts of those chivalrous monarchs, Francis I. of France, and the Fifth James Stuart of Scotland."

The biographies in this volume commence with Margaret Tudor, daughter of King Henry VII. and sister of King Henry VIII. She was born princess royal of England, in the palace of Westminster, A.D. 1489, and, the day after her birth, was baptized with royal pomp and ceremony in the adjoining parish church of St. Margaret's. It is curious to compare the ceremonial on this occasion with the forms of the present day; and really, taking into account all the religious changes which have since occurred, there is no such very great dissimilarity between royal baptisms in 1850 and in 1490. We miss, however, "the sacred silver font brought from Canterbury cathedral," and the "golden salt-cellar," and the "wax tapers," which then played a conspicuous part; but, on the other hand, we have in the present day the water of the River Jordan itself employed in our royal baptisms,—a custom, if we mistake not, derived from France. Passing over the curious details which are given of the management of the Princess Margaret during her infancy and early childhood, we come to the designs and policy of which she was the subject even from the moment of her birth. It was the purpose of her father, King Henry VII., from an early period of his reign, to make James IV., king of Scotland, his friend and ally, by giving to him the hand of his eldest daughter; and the baptism of the infant princess on St. Andrew's Day was intended as a special compliment to this sovereign and to the Scottish people. Even in her early infancy overtures were made to the Scottish king for his betrothal with the English princess; and, although he had already attained to man's estate before she was born, the overtures were not rejected, inasmuch as they enabled him to meet the remonstrances of his own counsellors against an attachment which he had formed elsewhere, by encouraging them to hope that he should at some future time form a matrimonial alliance with the princess of England. It appears, that so early as A.D. 1500 a dispensation had been obtained for this marriage, when Margaret was but eleven years of age; and in the following year the death of Arthur, prince of Wales, the eldest son of Henry VII., in leaving only one remaining son to that monarch, rendered the alliance with his daughter a matter of still more importance. The possible consolidation of the whole Britannie empire by means of such an alliance began to occur to sagacious politicians; and at length, in 1502, a formal embassy arrived,



consisting of the Earl of Bothwell and the Archbishop of Glasgow, and demanded the hand of the Princess Margaret.

"The proposition was thankfully accepted by Henry VII., and laid before his Privy Council, at which debate occurred the celebrated saying, often quoted from Lord Bacon, in proof of the foresighted wisdom of that sovereign. One of the English lords present having objected that 'the Princess Margaret, being next heir to her brother Henry, England might chance to become a province to Scotland;' 'No,' replied King Henry, 'the smaller will ever follow the larger kingdom.'"

The parliament of England having proved refractory, and declining to give any marriage-portion to the princess, King Henry VII. was obliged to provide a dowry out of his own private purse; and the sum of 10,000*l.*, to be paid by instalments in three years, was all that the King of England could then afford to give as a dowry, while the princess was secured a jointure of 2000*l.* on lands in Scotland; and it was stipulated that she should have the attendance of twenty-four English servants, besides those Scottish attendants whom her lord the king might deem requisite for her dignity. All these preliminaries having been duly arranged, the marriage took place by proxy, the Earl of Bothwell acting for the king, his sovereign; and the other procurators for the marriage being the Archbishop of Glasgow and the elect Bishop of Murray.

As soon as the vows of betrothal had been completed, Elizabeth of York, queen of Henry VII., rose, and, taking the princess by the hand, led her to a banquet set out in her private apartments, where she was placed at table as if she had been a queen visiting her, and both dined from one dish. Similar ceremonies took place at the king's table, and a splendid jousting followed in the afternoon.

"Then, by the advice of her ladies, the young Queen of Scots gave personal thanks to all the gentlemen and nobles who had jousted in her honour. After the prizes had been distributed among them with her royal hand, a goodly pageant entered the hall, curiously wrought with *fenestralis* (windows), having many lights burning in the same, in manner of a lantern, out of which *sorted* (issued in pairs) divers sorts of *morisks*. Also a very goodly disguising of six gentlemen and six gentlewomen, who danced divers dances; then followed a wide, or banquet."

John Young, Somerset Herald, has been an invaluable friend to Miss Strickland in the earlier part of her account of the espousals of Margaret to the King of Scots. The minuteness with which this writer enters into all the details of costume, entertainments, manners, and habits, furnishes exactly the sort of information which is most essential to such a writer as Miss Strickland. The Somerset Herald accompanies the juvenile queen, then but thirteen years of age, in her magnificent progress through

the midland and northern counties of England, to her new home. Curious incidents illustrative of the rude state of society at that period, occur; such, for instance, as the performing of the royal toilet in a litter by the road-side, when some grand procession was near at hand. In fine, after all kinds of rejoicings, processions, feasts, and goodly devices, the bridal party rest for a couple of days at Berwick, in order to appear in "all their bravery," on occasion of their entrance into the realm of Scotland; and then the queen is handed over in due form and ceremony to her loving subjects, of whom the voracious chronicler, John Young, notes with some disappointment, that instead of being bedight in gold and tinsel, they wore only "doublets of good cloth or camlet"—a fact which, to the Somerset Herald, was as distressing, apparently, as the omission, at Durham, to "shoot off" artillery or ordnance in honour of the princess.

How ably our authoress introduces the contrast between the ruder and sterner scenery, manners, and habits of the northern kingdom, with which the youthful princess was first made acquainted!

"In those days of semi-civilization, it was a breach of etiquette, as it is now among the Orientals and the South American Indians, for exalted persons to express surprise at any thing unusual which presented itself before their eyes; therefore, it cannot be expected that Margaret's herald chronicler should mention her natural astonishment at the romantic scene which now opened to her view. Yet, reared as she had been among the soft meads of Shene, and never accustomed to raise her eyes to higher ground than Richmond Hill, she must have been struck with her progress through the bold defile of Cockburn's-path, anciently Colbrand the giant's path,—for it is connected with the earliest superstitions of the island. Royal letters in those days were devoted to other purposes than recording impressions of the beauties of nature; no trace of any such feeling can be found in Margaret Tudor's innumerable epistles. Still her eyes must have rested, as ours have done, on the wild and wondrous scenery through which she was brought 'to bedward' that night.

"Fastcastle is no other than the veritable Wolf's-Crag Tower, celebrated in Scott's *Bride of Lammermoor* as the abode of the Master of Ravenswood. It is seated on a lofty promontory, which commands the lonely indented bay of which St. Abb's Head forms the extreme point to the right, with a wild array of rifted rocks terminating in the Wolf-Crag, which soars high in mid-air above the fortress—black, gloomy, and inaccessible. The way by which the southern bride and her company reached this rugged resting-place lay across the Lammermuir, several miles of wild heath and treacherous bog, which no stranger might traverse in safety without guides well acquainted with the track. Before they entered on this pass, they had to descend a hill so steep and precipitous, that even within the last century it was customary for the

passengers by the mail-coach between Berwick and Edinburgh to alight and cross it on foot, while the carriage was taken off the wheels and carried over by a relay of men, stationed on the spot for that purpose. Of course the roads were not better in the beginning of the sixteenth century. Fastcastle is approached by one or two descents and ascents of this kind, and is separated from the main land by a cleft between the rocks, which has to be crossed by a natural bridge, formed of a ledge of rock, without rail or guard, with the vexed billows boiling and thundering sixty feet below.

“When the young Tudor queen made her passage across this *Al Arat* of the Caledonian coast, she had the German ocean before her, which beats against the rocky battlements and defences with which the basement of the castle is surrounded. One of these masses resembles the upturned keel of a huge man-of-war stranded among other fragments, which, like the relics of a former world, lay scattered at the foot of the precipice, with the wild breakers rushing through their clefts, forming a grand *jet-d'eau*, and tossing the light feathery foam on high. The larger rocks are the haunt of innumerable sea-birds. Fastcastle had formerly been the stronghold of some of those ferocious feudal pirates, who may be regarded as the buccaneers of the Caledonian coast. Many a bloody deed had been perpetrated within its isolated and inaccessible circuit; but the festive solemnities and ceremonials that surrounded the royal bride allowed no leisure or opportunity for whispers of the dark tales and romantic traditions connected with its history. Thoroughly tired must she have been with her long journey, and the onerous task of playing the queen, instead of tossing her ball and joining in the loud laughter and jocund sports of the companions of that gay and happy childhood from which she had suddenly been compelled to step into the more than womanly cares and responsibilities of a crowned head in a land of strangers.”

This rude stronghold must indeed have presented many strange objects to the young princess, who was transferred at the age of thirteen to a foreign land. She appears, however, to have learnt, at least, the etiquette of her station, and to have borne herself with all the dignity and gravity exacted by court ceremonial: and, judging from her general character, it is probable that she relished, very highly, the attention of which she became the object, and the display of equipage and dress which her station justified and required. Her education appears to have been cared for, as far as the mere externals of address and demeanour were concerned, and she was a proficient in dancing and in music. But in the more substantial and simpler requisites of an ordinary education—writing and spelling—her performances appear to have been wretched; and our authoress never omits an opportunity of betraying to us the sad short-comings of Queen Margaret, by italicizing her mistakes, which, to say the truth, are



perfectly monstrous, though not so intentional as the coarse pleasantries of her brother, "King Hal," who invariably wrote of one of her husbands as "Lord *Muffin*," such being his version of the graceful title of "Methven." Queen Margaret's education had been neglected in still more important points. She appears never to have been instructed in the important duties of self-control, and of integrity and honourable dealing. Her life was a tissue of mean jealousies, intrigues, and treacheries, invariably guided by the most excessive selfishness: and a stranger contrast could not be presented than between such a disposition and that of the high-minded, and generous, but passionate prince, her consort, with whose romantic character we have been made acquainted in *Marmion* and the *Lady of the Lake*. Her father's policy, however, sacrificed any chance of happiness for her in life, by matching her with a sovereign who was thirty-one years of age when she was only thirteen at their marriage, and who excited her jealousy by the attentions which he continually offered to ladies who had passed the age of childhood, while the unfortunate Margaret, thus prematurely exposed to the cares and anxieties of married life, passed the earlier years of her marriage in continual illness and despondency, without the consolation of feeling that she possessed her consort's undivided affection, and without inward strength of mind to bear her up amidst the loneliness of her foreign home. Some of her letters express very strongly the desolation of her position.

After the marriage of the royal pair had been celebrated in Scotland with great pomp and ceremony, of which we have many amusing details, gathered from the records of the Somerset Herald, King James took his bride on a wedding tour through the south of Scotland, to show his subjects his English consort, during which, as it was observed by Bishop Lesley, they were nobly entertained at abbeys, and propitiated by rich purses of gold, the queen being equally favoured with the king in the latter respect, and probably accepting such gifts with no little satisfaction. Indeed she must have often reverted in thought to those pleasurable moments in after-years, when her necessities or her avarice induced her to assume the character of an unfortunate beggar in her correspondence with the English court. We have the following curious accounts of the royal bounties to minstrels shortly after Margaret's marriage:—

"Margaret was still a child, therefore notations of pleasure and amusements constitute the sole records of her married life for a year or two. The anniversary of her marriage in 1504 was spent in the fortress of Dunottar, of which the head of the noble family of Keith was then Castellan. Here, in August, James IV. kept court with princely

cheer, and gave, in the course of the month, many donations to Margaret's musical band. 'Two English songstresses, who sang in the pavilion to the queen at Dunottar castle, had a donation of 27s. The king likewise ordered a benefaction of 18s. to the *chield* that played on the monchord.' Queen Margaret's luter had fees amounting to 56s.; likewise Pate Harper, who played the *clarcha*. The English boy Cuddy, and Souter the luter, got a share in a largess of 3*l.* 10s., given by the royal Stuart. The queen's luter was given a donation to get his lute out of pawn; four Italian minstrels had fees to clear them of the town; and Hog, the tale-teller or *diseur*, was given a benefaction of 13s."

Several years after her marriage, Margaret became the mother of a prince, to the extreme joy of her consort, who in order to testify his affection for her, undertook a pilgrimage on foot to the shrine of St. Ninian, in Galloway, in order to obtain the recovery of her health; and the good people of Scotland were greatly edified, not only by this act of devotion, but by the coincidence of Queen Margaret's recovery, at the moment when the king offered in her behalf at the shrine of St. Ninian's. Of course the queen herself could do no less than follow up the example by making a pilgrimage of thanksgiving to the same place; whither she was accompanied by seventeen pack horses of baggage, while the "chapel graith" or plate and furniture of her chapel, came in two coffers. King James's wardrobe was carried by three horses—no very great allowance after all, and scarcely as much as some gentlemen of our acquaintance travel with even now.

But the unfortunate young queen was destined to lose her eldest son shortly after his birth, and another, who survived to be two years of age; nor was it till the tenth year of her marriage, that a son was born who was christened James, and who afterwards succeeded to the throne of Scotland. In the following year she became a widow, by the unfortunate event of Flodden Field, in which the sovereign of Scotland fell, in the flower of his age, and with him all the leading aristocracy of the country. Queen Margaret had been urgent with her husband to declare war against her brother, King Henry, who had withheld from her certain jewels and other valuables, to which she was entitled, under the will of Prince Arthur, her elder brother. Her extreme urgency on this point, combined with the obligations of the old treaty existing between France and Scotland, and the correspondence of Anne of Brittany, queen of France, who chose King James for her knight, and urged him to do his devoir by marching three days with banners displayed over the borders, led at length to the declaration of war, which issued so

fatally for Scotland. As soon as the king had resolved on this course, Margaret became extremely alarmed, and sought to dissuade her consort from his intentions. She endeavoured, according to Miss Strickland, to introduce the supernatural in aid of her other arguments; and it appears that her dreams, by which she sought to terrify the king, "were dreamed for the nonce, as preludes to the following incident, which was probably contrived (or at least connived at) by her :"—

"James IV. had passed a few days at the queen's palace at Linlithgow, before he called together his feudal muster. At the council held in the morning, it was observed he was out of spirits. In the evening he attended vespers at the stately abbey-church of St. Michael, adjoining to the queen's palace, for the purpose of praying for the success of the expedition. While praying in St. Catherine's Chapel, near the porch, 'there came ane man, clad in a blue gown or blouse, belted about him with a roll of white linen: he had brodikins or buskins on his feet. His head was bare, bald on the top, with yellow locks hanging on each side: his age about fifty. He came fast forwards among the lords, crying and speering specially for the king, saying, 'that he wanted to speak with him.' It seems that petitions were often presented by the people when the king was at his devotions. He made no due reverence to him, or salutations, but leaned him *gruffling* upon the desk (bent down to the desk), and spoke thus,—'Sir king, my mother has sent me to thee, charging thee not to go where thou art purposed; which, if thou do, thou shalt not fare well, nor none that is with thee. Further, she forbade thee not to seek nor follow the counsel of women; which, if thou do, thou wilt be confounded and brought to shame.'

"By the time these words were spoken, even-song was nearly done. The king paused, studying to give him an answer. Meantime, before the king's eyes, and in presence of all the lords about him, 'like the blink of the sunbeam, or the whiff of the whirlwind, the man vanished away, and could no more be seen.' 'I heard,' continues Lindsay of Pitscottie, 'Sir David Lindsay and John English, the marshal, (who were at that time both of them young men, and special servants to the king's grace,) thought to have taken this man, that they might have speered further tidings at him; but they could not touch him.'

Tradition and general opinion connect this scene with Queen Margaret as its designer, or as privy to the plan. King James appears to have suspected something of the kind, for he made no inquiries into the circumstance, and evidently attributed it to no supernatural causes. He went on his preparations in spite of this warning, and also of another attempt to intimidate by the ghostly summons issued at the market cross of Edinburgh, where the nobles, gentry, and others were summoned to the infernal regions within forty days. Such means of arresting an impending war sound very absurd in our ears; but the mere



notion that kings and nobles could be influenced by such visions is amongst the most striking proofs of the immense change which has passed over the mind of man since those times. It is plain, also, that although King James was not himself influenced by these appearances, there were not wanting those who regarded them as miraculous; and, after the unfortunate issue of the Battle of Flodden, such predictions would naturally gain an attention they did not deserve; and, without doubt, the circumstances attending them were exaggerated, and rendered still more strange and supernatural by popular tradition and superstitious feeling. Indeed, the story of the ghostly summons of the market cross appears to have rested only on the testimony of one individual. "It is most probable," says Miss Strickland, "that Richard Lawson was the very person who contrived the incident; as he was one of the civic authorities, he had particular opportunities of arranging aught that was done or acted at the market cross; he was the only witness of the matter; and he was evidently of the peace, or queen's party."

Previously to his departure for Scotland, King James constituted his queen guardian of the prince, in case of his own death, and at the same time he confided to her the place of his treasure, and authorized her to receive, in trust for his infant son, the last subsidy which Louis XII. had paid him, being eighteen thousand golden sols, or crowns of the sun: and also placed in her possession many other valuables belonging to the crown.

The avaricious disposition of Margaret was unable to resist the opportunity of appropriating to her own use this mass of treasure, and accordingly, when the Scottish parliament assembled in consequence of the death of King James, and proceeded to settle the affairs of the State, the strange discovery was made, that the royal exchequer was wholly exhausted. The queen, however, whom no one suspected, was made regent, pursuant to the will of her consort.

"The parliament of Scotland was convened by Queen Margaret to meet at Stirling Castle, December 21, 1513, there the will of James IV. was read: although his request that Margaret would take upon her the regency and personal care of the infant king, was against the ancient customs of Scotland, which always placed the executive power in the hands of the next male heir; yet, the hearts of all present, being full of tenderness to the memory of their loved and lost monarch, no one could bear to gainsay his last wishes. Queen Margaret was, therefore, unanimously recognised as their regent, and the young king was solemnly given into her care. The Lord Chancellor, James Beton, Archbishop of Glasgow, the Earls of Arran, Huntley, and Angus, were deputed to assist her. Stirling Castle, the great palatial fortress

of Scotland, was appointed as the residence of the infant monarch, and of the prince or princess the queen was expected to produce. Queen Margaret was to have possession of Stirling Castle until her son James V. came of age. But all her power and grandeur as reigning sovereign of Scotland were to cease if she made a second marriage: on this head the testament of James IV. was stringent."

Thus was Margaret, at twenty-four years of age, invested with the sovereign rule of Scotland, and she might have probably continued to sway the northern sceptre for many long years, had she not become enamoured of the youthful Earl of Angus, then but eighteen years of age. The queen had already been connected by policy with the powerful house of Douglas, and her sudden passion for its head was encouraged by the artful representations of his grandfather, Lord Drummond of Stobshall, who represented how impossible it was for the English party in Scotland to stand against the French faction, if the Duke of Albany should arrive as governor, unless the queen strengthened herself by the aid of the mighty Douglas clan and their adherents, amongst which the Drummond family alone would outweigh all the objections that might be made by the rest of the nobility to a second marriage of the queen. These arguments of state, coinciding exactly with the queen's private wishes, she proceeded to lavish, with the headlong favouritism of the Tudors, all appointments in the gift of the crown on the Douglas family and their friends. Gavin Douglas, the uncle of the Earl of Angus, was made Bishop of Dunkeld, and destined to be Archbishop of St. Andrew's. And shortly afterwards, only a year after the death of King James IV. at Flodden, Margaret was privately married to the Earl of Angus. Her attempt, immediately afterwards, to force Gavin Douglas on the see of St. Andrew's by her own authority, without any regard to the rights of election inherent in the Church, and the contest on which she entered with the Church, excited public attention, and caused inquiry into her motives for this proceeding, when it was discovered that she had been privately married to Angus.

"Great was the commotion, violent the rage, and intense the indignation of all ranks and conditions of the Scottish people. At last it was remembered, that if the Church had submitted more than was her duty to the despotism of the monarchical authority, by admitting the two preceding archbishops of St. Andrew's, Queen Margaret had no right to the same complaisance, since she had forfeited her regal station from the moment she had given herself in second wedlock to the Earl of Angus."

The result of this untoward discovery was, that the council met and deposed the queen from the regency, and, in conjunction

with Parliament, offered it to the Duke of Albany, the next heir to the throne, who had become naturalized in France. A scene of great confusion followed, each party endeavouring to gain the ascendancy; but the queen's party was the weaker, and she was ultimately compelled to relinquish the persons of the princes, her sons, to the care of the Regent Albany. We have the following interesting account of the mode in which this was accomplished:

"A more difficult undertaking than the deprivation of her political power was to wrest her children from Queen Margaret. The regent evidently demurred on a proceeding in which the kindest measures taken could not fail of seeming cruel in the extreme. July had nearly passed away, yet Queen Margaret still held possession of her little sons at the castle of Edinburgh. Albany made his approaches with great caution, while the Parliament was sitting at the Tolbooth. Then the national council chose eight peers, and out of them Albany was to appoint four by lot; and from the four Queen Margaret was to choose three to intrust with the care of her royal infants.

"The four peers went in solemn procession from the Tolbooth (where the Parliament sat) up to Edinburgh castle-gate. All the Guild Town followed them on foot, in immense concourse, to behold the exciting drama in which their queen and her little ones played the principal parts. The gates were unfolded, and the people beheld the queen standing within the entrance, holding the young king, with his hand clasped in hers; behind her was the nurse, with the infant Duke of Ross in her arms; near her stood her husband Angus, and her household made a half circle in the rearward.

"The queen had certainly drawn up her little force with great scenic skill, and it had its due effect on the good people of Edinburgh, who hailed the *tableaux vivans* before them with long and loud acclamations. When some degree of silence was restored, which was only when the populace had shouted themselves hoarse, Queen Margaret, seeing the approach of the delegates from the Tolbooth, gave the words with much majesty and command, of—'Stand! Declare the cause of your coming before you draw nearer to your sovereigns.'

"The four Scottish peers replied, 'that they were deputed by the Parliament then sitting, to demand and receive their infant king and his brother.'

"All the answer Margaret vouchsafed was, 'Drop the portcullis!' To the consternation of the parliamentary deputies, the massive iron gate thundered down betwixt them and the royal group.

"The queen then addressed the lords commissioned to take her infants from her arms: 'This castle of Edinburgh is part of my infeoffment! By the late king, my husband, I was made sole governess of it, nor to any mortal shall yield the command. But I require, out of respect to Parliament and the nation, six days to consider their mandate: for my charge is infinite in import; and, alas! my counsellors be few!' She then led away her little monarch from the gateway, fol-



lowed by her train; and the peers retired in great admiration of her beauty and high spirit."

We must pass over the interesting adventures of Margaret, in her escape from Scotland, and her reception by King Henry VIII. with fraternal cordiality. Here her mendicancy both to Henry himself and to Cardinal Wolsey, his minister, becomes absurdly importunate. No Irish beggar-woman was ever more persevering and more varied in her contrivances to extort money. Whatever was the subject of her epistle, like many a piquant anecdote which we peruse unsuspectingly in the public journals until we are entrapped into some recommendation of spectacles or dress, she always concludes with a request for plate, jewels, or cash. King Henry ultimately got weary of this propensity of his sister's, but he yielded to it for a time, and Margaret, when permitted to return to Scotland, arrived in very different guise from that in which she had left it, without possessions, treasure, or even wardrobe.

"'The Queen of Scots,' says her contemporary Hall, 'who had been a whole year at court and at Baynard's Castle, at the king's charge, and was richly appointed of all things meet to her estate, both jewels, plate, tapestry, arras, coin, horses, and all things of her brother's gift, liberally, departed out of London to Scotland, May 18, with great riches, albeit she entered England in great poverty. All her charges, both going and returning, were made at our king's cost.' Thus the 'sort of things' Margaret had to do at Baynard's Castle was no other than securing this vast store of goods she had to convey back to Scotland!"

But no sooner had Queen Margaret returned to Scotland, than she became discontented with the conduct of her husband, the Earl of Angus, and she commenced a process for obtaining a divorce from him. The history of her proceedings in this case, and in another (for the queen married husbands and repudiated them something in the style of her brother, Henry VIII.), will show the extreme laxity of the Papal See on the subject of divorce, at that time. The example, indeed, had been set in the case of Louis XII., who, after he had been married to the Princess Joanna of France for twenty years, was divorced from her by Alexander VI. in 1498, on the plea that the princess's father, Louis IX., had been *god-father* to the king, and that no dispensation had been obtained, with other pleas equally frivolous; the *real* inducement being the investiture, by Louis, of the Pope's son, Cæsar Borgia, with the duchy of Valentinois.

With so convenient an example of Papal complaisance within the preceding twenty years, Queen Margaret flattered herself that

she should find some means of inducing the Pope to dissolve her marriage with the Earl of Angus ; and, having made her peace with the Regent Albany, she succeeded, through his interest, after about seven years' perseverance, in obtaining the divorce she sought for. We extract the following account of the conclusion of the affair :—

“ Margaret's present object was to arrive at some decision concerning her divorce: for this purpose she affected to be on very friendly terms with Angus, and even had some amicable consultations with him on the subject. Finding the delays of Rome interminable, she contrived to enlist Beton, Archbishop of St. Andrew's, on her side, who summoned Angus to hear his divorce from the queen pronounced according to the laws of the Church. He appeared on the day appointed at the consistorial court of St. Andrew's. Then the queen alleged ‘that he had been betrothed, and given his faith and promise of marriage to a noble lady (some say, a daughter of the Earl of Traquair, and others, of Earl Bothwell), before he had married her (the queen), and so, by reason of that pre-contract, he could not be her lawful husband.’ The earl confessed all: upon which the archbishop pronounced sentence of divorce, making a proviso, ‘that the daughter born of the queen should not suffer loss or disadvantage’ from the ignorance of her mother or her father's pre-engagement.

“ The legality of this sentence was immediately disputed. The flaw appears to have been, the uncertainty which of the two noble ladies, Janet Douglas, or Margaret Hepburn, was Angus's *fiancée* when he wedded the queen. There is nothing definite, therefore, alleged in any of the sentences of divorce. Another passed later in the same year, dated at Ancona, in which the Pope mentions the marriage as infirm and bad, but gives no specific reason why it was so.”

Queen Margaret had already provided herself with a new husband before the divorce had been solemnly pronounced ; and, as soon as that sentence was made public, she announced Henry Stuart, captain of her guard, as her spouse. It is a curious coincidence, that the proceedings for the divorce of Henry VIII. from Catharine of Aragon commenced in the same year which brought to a close his sister's divorce from Angus ; but, strangely enough, King Henry looked with great disfavour on proceedings so analogous to his own.

“ So far from pleading the example of his sister's long-pending divorce, Henry was heartily ashamed of the false position in which he exhibited himself in the eyes of the courts of Europe, as if he aped Margaret's disreputable proceedings. It is curious enough to find him urging Wolsey perpetually to delay his sister's divorce at the court of Rome, which was done with such success that, of course, he became furiously suspicious that similar means were used when his own turn came.”

At first, the queen and her husband were compelled to yield to the storm which was raised by the Douglas faction, on her marriage, and she was even obliged to conceal herself for some time ; but, in one of those sudden revolutions of which Scotland exhibited so many examples, she shortly afterwards recovered her position, and her husband was created Lord Methven by James V., and was granted extensive possessions and high offices. In the course of some years, however, Methven contrived to displease his wife, and another divorce was set on foot. Apparently, this divorce also would have been conceded, the Court of Rome having doubtless learnt, in the interval, from the result of Henry's divorce cause, that it was imprudent to restrict the wills of sovereigns ; but King James V. most undutifully "prevented the sentence from being promulgated," though Queen Margaret "had provided her judge with four-and-forty *famous* proofs, as cause of divorce between her and Lord Meffin !" There were some persons malicious enough to suppose that she designed to re-marry her *second* husband, the Earl of Douglas ; but her intended appears to have been a person named "John Stuart." The inconvenient interference, however, of her son caused the overthrow of these fine plans, and subsequently, under the influence of his queen, Mary of Lorraine, she even relinquished her design, and lived in harmony with "Lord Muffin" till her death.

The character which Miss Strickland has described in her life of Margaret Tudor is altogether one of the most unpleasing we have ever met with. There is a cold selfishness, an utter absence of all high, honourable, and natural feeling about it, which entirely precludes any sympathy with her in the numerous calamities in which her ambition and avarice involved her. And this is felt still more strongly when contrasted with the beautiful picture of gentleness and love which immediately succeeds, in the brief, but touching memoir of Magdalene of France.

The history of the happy marriage of James V. and Magdalene is one of those episodes on which the imagination loves to rest ; one of those rare instances in which the policy of states has been subordinated to the instincts of natural human feeling, and in which the mind delights to dwell on virtuous love hallowing the union of princes.

Magdalene of France was the daughter of Francis I., and was at an early age destined to be united to the young King of Scots. This design was however broken off by political intrigues, and also in consequence of the failing health of the princess, who manifested symptoms of the family tendency to consumption, which had already cut off her two sisters.

Under these circumstances, Francis entreated the King of



Scots to transfer his addresses to the Lady Mary de Bourbon, eldest daughter of the Duke de Vendôme, the first prince of the blood royal of France. James acceded so far to the wishes of his royal ally as to despatch an embassy to the court of the Duke of Vendôme, to open a matrimonial treaty; but the Scottish king was determined to judge for himself, and was not content to see his future queen through any eyes but his own. He accordingly set forth for France, with 100 of his nobles, knights, and gentlemen; but keeping from them as a secret the destination and object of his voyage. Accident, however, made them acquainted with the truth; and the result was, that they actually changed the course of the vessel, and King James found himself again on the coast of Scotland instead of approaching the coast of France. A second attempt proved more successful, and King James was soon seen walking, incognito, about the streets of Paris, and making sundry purchases for the decoration of his outward man, in contemplation of the resumption of his proper rank. An amusing account is given of his doings in this respect, and of the liberal payment which must have indicated the rank of the employer to the operatives of Paris. After some time spent in Paris, the royal adventurer, travelling as the servant of his keeper of the wardrobe, went to the ducal château of Vendôme on the Loire.

“King James, instead of declaring himself, took the opportunity, which one of the continental fêtes or public days afforded to him and his pretended master, John Tennent, of mingling with the spectators and guests of humble degree at the lower end of the hall, fancying he should be able to make his observation *perdue* on the young princess, to whom his hand was pledged. Nature had stamped the impress of nobility too legibly on the graceful and majestic lineaments of James Stuart for him to pass unnoticed in a crowd. The princess, whom he had come so far to look upon by stealth, having been inspired with scarcely less curiosity than his own to see what manner of mate she had promised to wed, had, it seems, procured his portrait; and the moment she saw him, though in a serving man's array, among the menial train at the lower end of her father's hall, she recognized him by the likeness, and frankly advanced to greet him.”

Notwithstanding this frankness, or “pertness,” as old Lindsay of Pitscottie terms it, the fair lady of Vendôme did not succeed in winning the affections of the Scottish king, who retired from the engagement with far greater precipitation than he had entered it, to the infinite mortification and grief of the poor discarded princess.

We next find James visiting the court of France, where he was recognized by the dauphin, and introduced to Francis I.,

who, with all his family, was in deep grief at the recent death of his eldest son. The dauphin and King James found that Francis had retired to repose himself on his bed for his afternoon nap. The dauphin, however, knocked loudly and hastily at the door. "Who is it knocks so fast to disquiet me in my rest?" asked Francis from within. "It is the King of Scotland come to see your grace, and to give you comfort," said the dauphin. Francis, on this, sprang from his bed, opened the chamber-door, and received his royal visitor in his arms.

"The advent of a sovereign like James V. under such circumstances created a wonderful sensation among the nobles and ladies of the French court, more especially the latter. They marvelled at his boldness in undertaking so perilous a voyage in stormy weather, considering the roughness of the seas and the danger of the coast; that he should have ventured on such an expedition without asking for a safe conduct from either the King of England or the King of France; and that he should be travelling in a strange land, not only without a military escort for the protection of his person, but attended by so few servants. There was no court in Europe where the spirit of knight-errantry was so highly appreciated as in that of the chivalric Francis I.; no man better qualified, both by nature and inclination, to enact the part of a royal hero of romance than the fifth James of Scotland. Gay, gallant, beautiful, and fascinating, he excited the most enthusiastic feelings of admiration in every breast, but in none more ardently than in that of the young delicate invalid, who had been accustomed to regard him, from her earliest recollection, as her affianced husband. There are instances when sickness, instead of marring, adds a touching charm to female beauty, especially in early youth, when the malady is of a consumptive or hectic character. This was the case with the Princess Magdalene of France, who is described by contemporaries as a creature too fair and exquisite for this week-day world, in which she was to have but a brief continuance. King James, beholding in her the realization of his *beau-idéal* of feminine loveliness and grace, determined to break through all contracts, treaties, and entanglements that might prevent their union, and to woo and win her for his Queen."

The course of true love, however, according to the old proverb, was not to run quite smooth; for the council of France and the advisers of the King of Scotland raised abundance of difficulties; and Francis even went so far as to offer his younger daughter to King James in lieu of the elder, apprehending that the cold climate of Scotland and the voyage there might shorten the days of Magdalene, as he had been advised by the physicians. All engagements, treaties, reasons of state, and apprehensions, however, were compelled to give way before the ardour of the royal lovers.

“King James would have no one but her, sick or well, strong or weak. The Lady Magdalene was the mistress of his heart; and, the more difficulties that were made, the more eager he was to call her his own. As for Magdalene, she was deaf to all warnings. She had made up her mind to be Queen of Scotland, were the clime more ungenial than Lapland, and the people greater barbarians than Muscovites. She would be content to leave her own vine-clad hills, and all the refinements and luxuries of her native land, to share the fortunes of King James. Love, and the happiness of finding herself the beloved of the object of that first sweet passion which prevailed in her young heart over every other feeling, did that for the fair invalid which the skill of the physicians had failed to do,—it recalled her apparently to life, and all the hopes and blissful expectations from which she had been previously cut off in the spring-tide of existence.”

The marriage was celebrated at Nôtre Dame with extreme splendour, in the presence of the Kings and Queens of France and Navarre, the dauphin, the Duke of Orleans, seven cardinals, and all the nobility of France, and the loyal portion of that of Scotland. We have much interesting detail in Miss Strickland's pages, of the costume, ceremonial, banquetings, and rejoicings on this occasion; and this season of happiness was protracted for several months, during which James allowed his bride to remain at her father's court, in the hope that the voyage to Scotland might be undertaken at a more favourable season, and the health of the young queen be restored. At length, however, these few months of unmingled happiness came to an end, and the royal pair took their leave, loaded with presents, and accompanied by the good wishes and prayers of all France.

“The royal voyagers made the port of Leith, Saturday, May 19, being the fifth day from their embarkation, and Whitsun Eve. They landed at the pier amidst the acclamations of a mixed multitude of living lieges of all degrees, who came to welcome their sovereign home, and to see their new queen. Magdalene endeared herself for ever to the affections of the people by the sensibility she manifested on that occasion; for when ‘she first stepped on Scottish ground she knelt, and, bowing herself down, kissed the moulds thereof for the love she bore the king, returned thanks to God for having brought the king and her safely through the seas, and prayed for the happiness of the country.’ This was, indeed, entering upon her high vocation; not like the cold state puppet of a public pageant, but in the spirit of a queen who felt and understood the relation in which she stood both to the king and people of that realm. A touching sight it must have been to those who saw that young royal bride thus obey the warm impulse of a heart overflowing with gratitude to God, and love to all she then looked upon.”

In six short weeks that fair and happy young queen had yielded



up her pious and gentle spirit to her Maker! Consumption, checked for a while by the impulse given by her happiness, fastened again on its victim, and in that cold northern climate it speedily proved fatal.

With this melancholy history we must conclude. The second wife of King James, Mary of Lorraine, possessed many high qualities, and the abilities of her mighty house; but James must often have dwelt on the image of his loved and lost Magdalene of France, and it was probably her early death which caused so deep a shock to his feelings and affections, that when, in a few years afterwards, the death of his children was followed by a reverse to the Scottish arms, he was unable to bear up longer, and died of a broken heart. The volume continues with unabated interest to its close, when Mary of Lorraine is left a widow, with an unborn babe, the eagerly desired heir of the ancient kingdom of Scotland.

- ART. II.—1. *The Testimony. To the Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, and others in places of Chief Rule in the Church of Christ throughout the Earth, and to the Emperors, Kings, Sovereign Princes, and Chief Governors over the Nations of the Baptized.* 4to Edition. Printed by C. Morgan, Henry-street, Pentonville. 8vo Edition. Printed by Moyes & Barclay, Castle-street, Leicester-square.
2. *Narrative of Events affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole Christian Church.* Printed for Private Circulation, by George Barclay, Castle-street, Leicester-square. 1847.
3. *Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, to all the Kings of the World, to the President of the United States of America, to the Governors of the several States, and to the Rulers and People of all Nations.* Liverpool: Woodruff. 1845.
4. *Letters exhibiting the most Prominent Doctrines of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. By ORSON SPENCER, A.B., President of the Church of Jesus Christ, of L. D. S. in Europe. In reply to the Rev. William Crowell, A. M., Boston, Massachusetts, U. S. A.* Liverpool: Orson Spencer. 1848.
5. *Divine Authority; or, the Question, Was Joseph Smith sent of God? No. I. The Kingdom of God. Nos. II. and III. By ORSON PRATT, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.* Liverpool. 1848.
6. *A Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil.* No date.
7. *Absurdities of Immaterialism; or, a Reply to T. W. P. Taylder's Pamphlet, entitled, "The Materialism of the Mormons, or Latter-Day Saints, Examined and Exposed." By ORSON PRATT, one of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints.* Liverpool. 1849.
8. *Friendly Warnings on the Subject of Mormonism. Addressed to his Parishioners by a Country Clergyman.* London: Rivingtons. 1850.

HAVING in former numbers traced separately the origin of the two sects which have risen up in our day, one in this country, the other in America, with the pretension of being appointed by God to prepare the world for the Second Advent of Christ, we proceeded in our last number to point out the remarkable analogy which exists between them. We now proceed with the parallel; the length to which the subject necessarily extends having com-

pelled us to break off in the middle. Our readers will remember the singular coincidence, in point of time, of the first rise of the two sects, and the similarity of the statements in which they record their origin; and further, the striking resemblance between the views which they respectively take of the existing state of Christendom. It is true that there is a great difference, likewise, between the two, both in their doctrine and manner of living; but this difference is not greater than might naturally be expected from the fact that one of them rose in the highly cultivated and strictly regulated state of society in England, in the face of a Church which has preserved the primitive doctrine of the Gospel in all its purity and integrity, and still commands the assent and the respect of the great body of the nation,—while the other grows up in the semi-barbarous and lawless state of society which prevails in the Far West of America, in a country the population of which never had a Church, but is, in a religious point of view, a mere Babel-like conglomeration of religionists] of every conceivable variety, among whom the sapling of the true catholic Church planted in those parts, occupies, to the general apprehension, only the position of one among many sects, and has, therefore, little or no influence in checking the general growth of extravagance of doctrine and licentiousness of practice. Due weight being given to these considerations, it will probably appear, that in spite of the enormity of their errors and the grossness of their proceedings, Joseph Smith and his followers present no greater contrast to the tone of society and the state of religious knowledge in the Far West, than Mr. Henry Drummond and his associates, with their more subdued and refined fanaticism, to the social and religious aspect of the world by which they are surrounded. This acknowledged difference in the development of the two sects, so far from effacing the similitude between them, on the contrary brings out in stronger relief, to the eye of the thoughtful observer, the essential identity of the ground on which they both proceed, and of the principles on which they found their extraordinary, their analogous, and rival claims to be *κατ' ἐξοχήν* the Kingdom of Christ.

Depreciation of the existing Church and of her means of grace,—a wilful overlooking of the distinction between the Church and the heretical and schismatical communions by which she is surrounded,—the assumption, that since the apostolical age the Church has become extinct, or, at least, has not existed in her integrity,—and the pretension that they, the Irvingites or the Mormonites respectively, are the true Church, restored in preparation for the Lord's coming,—these are the essential features which characterize them both. At the close of our last article, we laid before our readers copious extracts from the document



entitled the "*Testimony*," in which the Irvingite sect propounded these extravagant notions and pretensions to the rulers of Christendom both spiritual and temporal. We now turn to a similar document issued by the Mormonites. This also runs in the name of "the twelve Apostles" of the true "Church." It is a much shorter and much less elaborate document, as well as much more recent, bearing date "New York, April 6th, 1845." It differs from the other, moreover, in this, that it is not addressed to any spiritual rulers, but only to temporal governors; and that, instead of being privately delivered to those to whom it was addressed, and not suffered to transpire beyond the pale of the sect, it has been published to the world. It opens thus:—

"Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. To all the Kings of the world, to the President of the United States of America; to the Governors of the several States, and to the rulers and people of all nations.

"Greeting,—Know ye that the kingdom of God has come, as has been predicted by ancient prophets, and prayed for in all ages; even that kingdom which shall fill the whole earth, and shall stand for ever.

"The great Elohim, Jehovah, has been pleased once more to speak from the heavens, and also to commune with man upon the earth, by means of open visions, and by the ministration of HOLY MESSENGERS.

"By this means the great and eternal High Priesthood, after the order of his Son (even the Apostleship), has been restored or returned to the earth.

This High Priesthood or Apostleship holds the keys of the kingdom of God, with power to bind on earth that which shall be bound in heaven, and to loose on earth that which shall be loosed in heaven; and, in fine, to do and to administer in all things pertaining to the ordinances, organization, government, and direction of the kingdom of God.

"Being established in these last days for the restoration of all things spoken by the prophets since the world began, and in order to prepare the way for the coming of the Son of Man.

"And we now bear witness that his coming is near at hand; and not many years hence, the nations and their kings shall see Him coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.

"In order to meet this great event, there must needs be a preparation.

"Therefore we send unto you, with authority from on high, and command you all to repent and humble yourselves as little children before the majesty of the Holy One; and come unto Jesus with a broken heart and a contrite spirit, and be baptized in his name for the remission of sins (that is, be buried in the water, in the likeness of his burial, and rise again to newness of life in the likeness of his resurrection), and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit, through the laying on of the hands of the apostles and elders, of this great and last dispensation of mercy to man.

"This Spirit shall bear witness to you of the truth of our testimony, and shall enlighten your minds, and be in you as the spirit of prophecy and revelation; it shall bring things past to your understanding and remembrance, and shall show you things to come.

"It shall also impart unto you many great and glorious gifts; such as the gift of healing the sick, and of being healed, by the laying on of hands in the name of Jesus; and of expelling demons; and even of seeing visions, and conversing with angels and spirits from the unseen world.

"By the light of this Spirit, received through the ministration of the ordinances—by the power and authority of the Holy Apostleship and Priesthood, you will be enabled to understand, and to be the children of light; and thus be prepared to escape all the things that are coming on the earth, and so stand before the Son of Man.

"We testify that the foregoing doctrine is the doctrine or gospel of Jesus Christ in its fulness; and that it is the only true, everlasting, and unchangeable gospel; and the only plan revealed on earth whereby man can be saved."—*Proclamation*, pp. 1—3.

An account of the new revelation, given by the hand of Joseph Smith, and of the constitution of the Church of Latter-Day Saints, follows, with an exhortation to all the nations of the earth to take their part in this great and glorious work. In the event of their refusing to do so, they are warned that it will be impossible for them to remain neutral, and that theirs will be the loss, as they will be vanquished in a great victory by the personal interposition of the Lord Jesus Christ descending on the Mount of Olives.

"In short the kings, rulers, priests, and people of Europe, and of the old world, shall know this once that there is a God in Israel, who, as in days of old, can utter his voice, and it shall be obeyed.

"The courts of Rome, London, Paris, Constantinople, Petersburg, and all others, will then have to yield the point and do homage, and all pay tribute to one great centre, and to one mighty Sovereign, or, THRONES WILL BE CAST DOWN, AND KINGDOMS WILL CEASE TO BE.

"Priests, bishops, and clergy, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Mahomedan, will then have to yield their pretended claims to the priesthood, together with titles, honours, creeds, and names, and reverence and obey the true and royal priesthood of the order of Melchizedek, and of Aaron; restored to the rightful heirs—the nobility of Israel; or, the dearth and famine will consume them, and the plague sweep them quickly down to the pit, as in the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who pretended to the priesthood, and rebelled against God's chosen priests and prophets in the days of Moses."—*Proclamation*, p. 8.

This is followed by a special appeal to the governments of the United States, exhorting them to promote the civilization of the Red Indians as "the descendants of Joseph," and to protect the

saints and indemnify them for the losses which they have sustained through the measures taken against them by the governments of the different states where they have been settled. In the event of their responding to this appeal, a promise is given them that they shall "be prospered and enlarged, and spread their dominion wide and more wide over this vast country, till not only Texas and Oregon, but the whole vast dominion, from sea to sea, will be joined with them, and come under their protection as one great, powerful, and peaceful empire of liberty and union." But if not, "the great Messiah shall execute judgment for the saints, and give them the dominion." The idea of the "saints" being deterred from the prosecution of their design by the forces arrayed against them is repudiated with utter scorn:—

"It is in vain to suppose that the sword, the musket, the thunder of cannon, or the grating and rattle of chains, bolts and bars, will take away the faith, hope, or knowledge of a Latter-Day Saint. They *know* some *facts*—and these will continue to be *known facts* when death and war in their most horrid forms are raging around them. They cannot shut their eyes upon these facts to please either governors, rulers, or the raging multitude.

"We would now make a solemn appeal to our rulers, and other fellow citizens, whether it is treason to *know*, or even to publish what we *know*? If it is, then strike the murderous blow, but listen to what we say.

"We say, then, in life or in death, in bonds or free, that the great God has spoken in this age.—*And we know it.*

"He has given us the holy priesthood and apostleship, and the keys of the kingdom of God, to bring about the restoration of all things as promised by the holy prophets of old.—*And we know it.*

"He has revealed the origin and the records of the aboriginal tribes of America, and their future destiny.—*And we know it.*

"He has revealed the fulness of the Gospel, with its gifts, blessings, and ordinances.—*And we know it.*

"He has commanded *us* to bear witness of it, first to the Gentiles, and then to the remnants of Israel, and the Jews.—*And we know it.*

"He has commanded us to gather together his Saints, on this continent, and build up holy cities and sanctuaries.—*And we know it.*

"He has said, that the Gentiles should come into the same gospel and covenant, and be numbered with the house of Israel, and be a blessed people upon this good land for ever, if they would repent and embrace it.—*And we know it.*

"He has also said, that if they do not repent, and come to the knowledge of the truth, and cease to fight against Zion, and also put away all murder, lying, pride, priestcraft, whoredom, and secret abomination, they shall soon perish from the earth, and be cast down to hell.—*And we know it.*



“He has said, that the time is at hand for the Jews to be gathered to Jerusalem.—*And we know it.*

“He has said that the ten tribes of Israel should also be revealed in the north country, together with their oracles and records, preparatory to their return, and to their union with Judah, no more to be separated.—*And we know it.*

“He has said, that when these preparations were made, both in this country and in Jerusalem, and the gospel in all its fulness preached to all nations for a witness and testimony, He will come, and all the Saints with him, to reign on the earth one thousand years.—*And we know it.*

“He has said, that He will not come in his glory and destroy the wicked, till these warnings were given, and these preparations were made for his reception.—*And we know it.*

“Now, fellow-citizens, if this knowledge, or the publishing of it, is *treason* or *crime*, we refuse not to die.

“But be ye sure of this, that, whether we live or die, the words of the testimony of this proclamation, which we now send unto you, shall all be fulfilled.

“Heaven and earth shall pass away, but not one jot or tittle of his revealed word shall fail to be fulfilled.

“Therefore, again we say to all people, repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for remission of sins, and you shall receive the Holy Spirit, and shall know the truth, and be numbered with the house of Israel.

“And we once more invite all the kings, presidents, governors, rulers, judges, and people of the earth to aid us, the Latter-Day Saints, and also the Jews, and all the remnants of Israel, by your influence and protection, and by your silver and gold, that we may build the cities of Zion and Jerusalem, and the temples and sanctuaries of our God; and may accomplish the great restoration of all things, and bring in the latter-day glory.”—*Proclamation*, pp. 12—14.

The concluding portion of the “*Proclamation*” is remarkably practical and businesslike:—

“In fulfilment of the work assigned them, let the Saints throughout the world, and all others who feel an interest in the work of God, forward their gifts, tithes, and offerings, for the building of the temple of the Lord, which is now in progress in the city of Nauvoo, in the state of Illinois.

“Let them also come on with their gold, and silver, and goods, and workmen, to establish manufactories and business of all kinds, for the building up of the city, and for the employment and support of the poor, and thus strengthen the hands of those who have borne the burden and heat of the day, and who have made great sacrifices in laying the foundation of the kingdom of God, and moving on the work thus far.”—*Proclamation*, p. 14.

Then comes a "solemn and earnest request" to "all editors of newspapers," both in America and elsewhere, to publish the Proclamation, which "cannot fail to interest the reading public, especially those who have prayed every day of their lives for the Lord's kingdom to come, and for his will to be done on the earth as it is done in heaven." Requests to promote its circulation are also addressed to "President Wilford Woodruff, who superintends the publishing department of the Latter-Day Saints in Liverpool;" to "Elder Jones, our minister to Wales;" to the German and Norwegian elders, and to "Elder Adison Pratt, our missionary to the Sandwich Islands;" and "last, but not least, to the editors of the *Cherokee Advocate*, and others of the remnant of Joseph." On their part, the apostles promise to publish one hundred thousand copies, gratis, from "their office, No. 7, Spruce-street, New York;" in aid of which publication, contributions are solicited, to be sent to the said office, where "copies for distribution" may be obtained "at fifty cents per hundred." Lastly:—

"The world are also informed, that further information can be had by applying to the following general publishing offices of the Latter-Day Saints:—Mr. John Taylor, *Times and Seasons* office, Nauvoo, in the State of Illinois; Messrs. Pratt and Brannan, *Prophet* office, No. 7, Spruce-street, New York; Mr. Wilford Woodruff, *Millennial Star* office, Stanley-buildings, Bath-street, Liverpool; also of our travelling elders, and in our religious meetings throughout the world."—*Proclamation*, p. 16.

It is at once apparent, that in all the main features there is the most striking similarity between the pretensions of the two sects,—equally apparent that they mutually exclude and thereby neutralize each other. If the pretensions of the Mormonites are well founded, those of the Irvingites must be false, and *vice versa*: the most obvious conclusion being that they are both false. The analogy of their rival claims does not, however, end here. If the question be asked, what is the characteristic mark by which this new and restored "Church"—whether it be the one, or the other—is distinguished? the answer is in both cases the same. It is the restoration of the fourfold ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, and along with it the revival of the miraculous gifts of the Spirit, the possession of which is, according to their theory, limited to the fourfold ministry; both the ministry and the miraculous gifts being essential to the integrity of the Church. The Mormonite idea on this point is fully set forth in the letters addressed by Orson Spencer, the president of the "Church" in Europe, to Mr. Crowell, a Baptist

minister at Boston (No. 4. at the head of this article). In dilating upon the spiritual destitution of Christendom, he says :—

“ Where, Sir, are the splendid gifts of apostles and prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, that Christ gave to men and set in his Church, for ever to continue in the ministry, edifying ‘the BODY of Christ till we all come to the unity of faith,’ and to such a knowledge of God, and fulness of power and wisdom as dwelt even in Jesus? They are no where to be found in modern Christianity! Modern Christianity has the effrontery and shamelessness even to say that she does not need them; consequently she says that she does not need ‘to come to unity of faith,’ and to that full and potent knowledge of God that Jesus in the flesh possessed, and had decreed that all Saints should possess and be like their ‘elder brother.’

“ Not one of these great and precious gifts are retained. The bare name of evangelists and pastors is retained in modern Christianity, without the shadow of the power and prophetic knowledge of the Holy Ghost, with which these officers were *obliged* to be endued in the primitive church. She admits, indeed, the form of the office, ‘denying the power.’ She says, indeed, that she can come to ‘unity of faith,’ &c., without apostles, and without the help of the good old-fashioned Almighty Holy Ghost.

“ But how long a time does she want to run for this prize of ‘unity of faith, &c.?’ She has been running for the stakes nearly EIGHTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, and is further from the goal than when she started. When she started, ‘false apostles and deceitful workers’ were her champions. In order to win the prize, these shed the blood of true apostles, and the blood of saints was found in their garments. And when her followers found that she had only the form or name of apostles and prophets without the power, she said, we have no further need of apostles, they have done their work, and miracles have ceased. Oh, thou blood-guilty, ‘lying,’ Gentile Christianity! thy lineage takes hold of the mother of abominations, clothed in scarlet! How great will be the severity of God’s judgments upon all that are accessory to modern Christianity, except they repent and obey the Gospel!”—*Orson Spencer’s Letters*, pp. 77, 78.

And further on :—

“ The Holy Ghost is the grand agent by which the different orders of priesthood have all their authority, wisdom, and power, to teach and administer the laws and ordinances of heaven to men on earth. The ‘MANIFOLD WISDOM OF GOD’ flows through these orders of priesthood from heaven to earth. But modern Christianity has abolished these orders of priesthood, as no longer necessary; consequently, the communications from heaven to earth have been stopped for nearly *eighteen hundred years*; and from *this cause* our race has witnessed the most appalling picture of the progress of crime and wretchedness, that has ever pervaded the earth since the dawn of creation. No man



has sufficient knowledge of figures to enumerate THE MILLIONS that have been slain in war, since the Gentiles were cut off for unbelief. The pestilence has never slumbered since man rejected the healing ordinance of God, for the aid of physicians that are of no value. Famine has locked hands with pestilence, causing *rot*, and *blast*, and *mildew* to lead many to fear that God had repented himself of the 'promised seed-time and harvest.'

"The social virtues that ought to be and ever would be, under the reign of God, like salubrious breezes of heaven, have become like the antagonistic and forked teeth of a *picking cylinder*, that, turned ever so much, will still be *picking* either in the offensive or defensive. The number of the oppressed is becoming so fearfully great and vast, that the captors know not where to find either room or keepers for their prisoners. The yoke of intolerance must have fresh iron fastenings of unheard of tenacity and rigour. The oppressor feels the danger of an awful outbreak from desperation that can be smothered no longer. The elements of revolution and self-destruction are sown deep in every government, and in every religious and social system that has not for its basis *truth immediately and continually revealed from heaven!*

"Now, all this direful state of things is because that men have 'forsaken God, the fountain of living waters, and hewn them out cisterns that can hold no water.' 'From the crown of the head to the soles of the feet,' modern Christianity, whether Protestant or Catholic, 'is full of wounds and bruises, and putrifying sores.'

"The prophets and apostles foresaw the Gentile apostasy that would spread over the earth, under the plausible name of Christianity, obliterating the knowledge of God, and 'denying the power of God, and changing his laws and ordinances,' till 'gross darkness should cover the people.' They saw the 'mystery of iniquity' working, and boldly foretold the '*falling away*'—the exaltation of the man of sin,—the removal of the priesthood and light of truth from the seven churches of Asia,—the refusal to 'teach all things that Jesus commanded,'—the irresistible fact, that men would not '*endure sound doctrines*,' but would multiply discrepant teachers to suit '*itching ears*,'—the introduction of '*damnable heresies*,' and the '*doctrines of devils*,' and the Church becoming like a blood-guilty '*harlot*,' that had exterminated the whole order of apostles, and prophets, and spiritual gifts, and even denied the need of any such order of gifts and ministry as existed in the primitive Church."—*Orson Spencer's Letters*, pp. 79—82.

And then, in reply to the question, "If the Apostolical Church is again re-established, where is it?" he makes answer:—

"It is in the mountains where the Lord's House is to be built in the last days; driven by the cruel hand of persecution to the very place where the Lord has declared He will '*hide* them till the indignation be overpast.' Do you also ask what kind of organization this Church has? The answer is, the same as that of the Apostolic Church in the days of Peter, consisting of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, &c.; with

the gifts of healing, tongues, interpretation, casting out devils, prophesyings, &c. Do you ask who has seen any of these miraculous fruits of this Church? I answer *a hundred thousand* living witnesses are ready to testify that the 'signs' which Christ said 'shall follow them that believe,' *do*, in very deed, follow believers in *this* Church. Do you say, are they credible witnesses? They were generally accounted credible persons, until they believed and obeyed this Gospel. Do their lives show that they do sincerely believe and love the apostolic Gospel which they profess? Nothing as yet, has been able to separate them from it; neither home nor country, nor the inheritances of their fathers, nor penury or reproach, or evil report, or cold, or nakedness, and no certain dwelling-place for years!"—*Orson Spencer's Letters*, pp. 96, 97.

Now let the reader compare with this the following passages from the "*Testimony*:"—

"God is unchangeable; and the character of the Church can no more be changed than the character of Him who ordained it in all its parts. Its character is such as He himself describes in his word; and no assembly, confederacy, association, or body of any kind whatsoever, or what name soever it may take, is the Church of God as it is in his contemplation and purpose, unless it answer the description He has given of it.

"Now the Apostle Paul, as in many passages of his epistles casually and unconnectedly, so most fully and distinctly, in his first epistle to the Corinthians and in his epistle to the Ephesians, declares what is the constitution of the Church as framed of God, what are its principal memberships and parts, and what is the end and purpose to be accomplished in the Church by the co-operation and mutual ministrations of those several parts, from whence we extract the following passages:—In his first epistle to the Corinthians, the twelfth chapter, after setting forth the diversities of gifts in divers men, in the body of Christ (the which he illustrates under the figure of the human body, and that body he declares 'is not one member, but many members, yet but one body,' whereof each hath need of all others), he saith, 'Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular; and God hath set some in the Church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that miracles; then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.' And in his epistle to the Ephesians, the fourth chapter, he saith, 'There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But unto every one of us is given grace, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore He saith, when He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.' 'And He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the

ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' . . .

"The saints must be perfected, not only by the indirect, but by the direct ministration of each of these ministries, and so the work of the ministry, internally, as well as externally, be fulfilled. It is not through the instrumentality of any one or two, but by receiving the blessing of all, that the child shall grow up into a perfect man ; forasmuch as it is God's law and ordinance in his Church, that by these four means, and neither by more nor by fewer, that growth shall be obtained : for these are each and altogether necessary to the revealing of God and the showing forth of his glory ; they are the gifts in the giving and receiving whereof God the Lord vouchsafes to dwell among men, and to this very end they were given. In other words, they are the ordinances whereby the essential goodness and blessings which are in God are manifested to the world, and poured into the bosom of the Church. They are ordained of God, because exactly adapted to those very ends, or rather they are the necessary and so the eternally ordained channels, whereby that Divine goodness and those blessings find their spontaneous means of manifestation and conveyance to man : and so far forth as they are withdrawn, and are not all and each existing in full exercise, his goodness is obscured and his blessings intercepted in their passage to the Church, and the Church fails to be the dwelling-place of God, the abode of his glory, and the declarer of his manifold wisdom to the principalities and powers in heavenly places. . . . .

"The Church is not a phantom of the imagination, nor is it merely a figure of speech to call it the 'body of Christ,' or its several parts members of that body ; the Church is a reality, visible, tangible, definite,—a community of men disposed in various relations one to the other, and to Himself their head, in so true and real a union, that the human body can only imperfectly represent, nay, is but an outward type and shadow of the Church, which is the great original and archetype in the mind and purpose of God. Nor are these gifts which He received for men, and gave to men, impersonal influences nor abstractions, but they are themselves living men, by whom the fulness which is in Himself is, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, dispensed unto the Church ; therefore, saith the Apostle, 'When He ascended up on high He received gifts (*ἑδωκεν*) for men ; and He gave some *men* (*τοὺς μὲν*, not *τά*) (*men*, not *gifts*) apostles, and some *men* prophets, and some *men* evangelists, and some *men* pastors and teachers. And again, they are not given for a time which hath already expired ;—the object to be attained by them hath not yet been accomplished, and by them alone can it be accomplished ; for the saints are not yet perfected, the work of the ministry hath not yet found its termination ; the body of Christ is not yet edified ; the whole people of God have not yet arrived in unity of faith unto the perfect man, the measure of the stature of Christ's fulness ; the Church hath not as yet been prepared as a spotless virgin for the marriage of the Lamb. And until these ends be accomplished, and that which be



perfect is come, the instruments of God's appointment, for effecting them, cannot be dispensed with, and ought not to be suspended in their operations. This will appear more evident from a consideration of the distinct offices of these several ministries."—*Testimony*, §§ 30, 31, 32. 35.

The necessity of the fourfold ministry to the integrity of the Church being thus declared, the absence of that fourfold ministry is advanced as an argument to prove that there has been no perfect Church upon earth since the extinction, as is alleged, of the apostolic office,—the succession of bishops not being recognized in the Irvingite theory, otherwise than as a most inferior and imperfect substitute until the time of the Church's restoration—and then in reference to the approaching advent of Christ, the question is asked, "Who shall abide the day of His coming?" to which the reply is:—

"It is only an holy people who can abide before Him walking as children of light and children of the day; it is only a people filled with the Holy Ghost, the servants of God, whom He sealeth on their foreheads before the four winds of heaven let loose the elements of destruction on the earth and on the sea.' And that ministry of the Holy Ghost cannot be given, that sealing cannot be affixed, the Church cannot be perfected, except through those ordinances which God gave at the first for that end. But they shall be given; all the promises contained in his word of the restoration of his Zion, in the hour of her greatest peril, shall be fulfilled; and that purpose shall be accomplished according to his own counsel, and by his own instrumentality, and by no man's devices. God will appear again in the mighty presence of his Spirit; again shall his gifts, given without repentance at the ascension of his Son, be manifested—apostles sent forth not of man, neither by man.—prophets, evangelists, and pastors and teachers, apostolically ordained, shall work the work of God in his church, and minister to the edifying of the body, and the body shall be replenished with life; the dead bones shall be brought together, framed again in their wonted order, and shall stand up a mighty army; and the followers of the Lamb, the undefiled, in whose mouth shall be no guile, without fault, before the throne of God, shall stand with the Lamb on mount Zion, the manifested first fruits unto God and the Lamb, the earnest of that glorious harvest, when the Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and shall gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."—*Testimony*, § 101.

The promise of the revival of the fourfold ministry here made is, however, further on in the "*Testimony*" declared to be already fulfilled:—

"To have poured out the Holy Ghost on any one of the various sects would have been to vindicate that one, when all had failed; to

have poured out the Holy Ghost on all, would have been to confirm each in its separateness and self-complacency. But God's purpose hath been to raise up apostles and prophets, laying again the ancient foundations; to rebuild thereon his spiritual temple, from thence to send his messengers, thither to invite, and there to bless all his children.

"He that dwelleth between the cherubims hath thus shone forth and stirred up his strength; and in reviving his fourfold ministry of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, He hath manifested again the eternal form of the going forth of the power of his Spirit for the revelation of Himself unto man; and by these proceeding into every land united, summed up and directed in his apostles, shall all the saints of God be gathered, cleansed, and builded into his temple, and all his people, all his churches, all his hierarchies be seen throughout the earth to be one."—*Testimony*, §§ 118, 119.

If the question be asked,—which most obviously suggests itself, especially considering the concurrent and mutually exclusive claims preferred by the two sects to the possession of this fourfold ministry, and of the gifts of the Spirit attached to it,—what proof there is of this revival of the fourfold ministry and of primitive apostolic gifts, we find both parties advancing pretensions to miracles wrought among them. It is a singular fact, however, and one which must strike the most superficial mind, that the miracles of the Irvingites and Mormonites differ from the miracles recorded in the New Testament, in this particular, that the latter miracles were wrought openly in the sight of all men, so openly and so manifestly, that the enemies of the Gospel could not gainsay them, but were forced to admit the reality of the miraculous facts; on the contrary, the miracles of the Irvingites and Mormonites are known only within the pale of those bodies themselves, and have not in any properly attested instance been wrought under the eyes, or for the conviction, of unbelievers. In connexion with this, it deserves to be noted, that both sects, inconsistently enough with the high claim they make to be the Church of Christ, revived in the fulness of her ministrations and spiritual powers (of which miraculous gifts are an essential part), speak in a tone of depreciation of the evidence of miracles; as if conscious of the untenable nature of their miraculous credentials. By the Irvingites, the absence of really miraculous evidence stands almost confessed. After the flattering picture drawn of the "Church" in contrast with the whole of Christendom<sup>7</sup>, and after an enumeration of all the points of superiority by which the Irvingite sect professes to excel all other communions, the "*Testimony*" thus continues:—

<sup>7</sup> See pp. 146, 147.

"These are *signs* of Apostleship thus again put forth, and are the sure pledges that, when the Lord shall please to send forth his Apostles, to lay hands upon his people, the seal also of their Apostleship shall then be in the Lord ; signs which have been wrought in all patience, indeed, if not hitherto as by St. Paul, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds, as men count wonders and might. And yet with signs and wonders ; for what so bears the impress of God as that, in the midst of a perverse and gainsaying people, a witness should be raised up against all the forms of sin which are hurrying men into the ranks of Antichrist ; and in things evident to the senses, also, in multiplied instances of healing the sick, and in deliverance—manifest to the eyes of men—of those oppressed by the devil in body and in spirit.

"Miracles, in the ordinary sense of the term, are not of themselves the test of truth. The evidences of the divine mission of the Lord Jesus Christ adduced by Himself, in the days of his flesh, were, first of all, his words and the fruit of them ; then his miraculous works. By the former, his disciples 'knew certainly that He came from God,' that 'He and the Father were one ;' and whilst the multitudes who saw his miracles, and many even of his disciples, fell away from Him, 'seeing, and yet not believing,' those who had tasted his words that they were precious, clave to Him still, saying, 'To whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life.'

"In the revival of his Church now, the Lord is bringing forth this twofold evidence, but chiefly the first. By the words of truth and life He is separating the spiritual remnant from the mass of profession throughout Christendom ; and, although he has confirmed his Church by many signs and wonders in these days, yet the chief evidence of his work is *truth*—the discovery of the foundations of his word. He is dealing with nations professedly spiritual, therefore his appeal to them is according to their standing toward Him. He appeals to the spiritual in them by setting forth the truth—the things new and old from the oracles of God. If they cannot discern Him pleading for truth and opening the Scriptures, they will not discern Him in casting out devils and raising the dead. It is because 'that in the last times they receive not *the love of the truth*, therefore God sends them strong delusion that they should believe a lie.' They will not believe the truth, because they have pleasure in unrighteousness. On the other hand, the mark of Antichrist in the last times is the working of signs and wonders ; by his wonders he will deceive the world, but by his lie he shall be detected by the saints. Again, the mark of the Lord's work in the last times is not only that truth in word is brought forth from the Scriptures, but that the fruits of that truth should appear in living men ; that his Church is rising from its ruins, according to the pattern given in the beginning ; that the spirit of Elias, who should come, restoreth all things, turning the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, the disobedient unto 'the wisdom of the just.' And the signs pre-eminently to be looked for in His Apostles, as in the Church, are those set forth in the Epistle to



the Church in Philadelphia,—a little strength, the *keeping of His word*, the not denying of his name.”—*Testimony*, §§ 114—116.

The absence of miraculous gifts, properly speaking, caused, as is well known to those acquainted with the history of Irvingism in its earlier stages, much dissatisfaction among the members, and even among the officers, of the new Church, and led to more than one secession. It helped, with other circumstances, to open the eyes of one who had himself been one of the prophets, and whose testimony, publicly borne, that the whole work was false, and, so far as it was supernatural, of the devil, we adduced on a former occasion<sup>8</sup>. Among those who doubted the work, was even Edward Irving himself, who died in a state of gloom and perplexity, and uttered many words of exhortation and warning on the subject to those in attendance on his death-bed. This fact stands recorded in certain manuscript letters, giving an account of the close of Irving’s life, which were privately circulated at the time, and which we ourselves have seen and perused, but under a special reservation that no copy should be made of them. This very awkward fact is got rid of, in the “*Narrative of Events*,” by the following cunningly constructed statement:—

“Mr. Irving, from whom the whole of the congregations obtained, with a show of justice, their name of distinction, having been called, not only to be Angel of the Church in London, but also to be an Evangelist and Prophet to his own land, was constrained by ill health to leave his place; and after visiting several parts of England and preaching, according to his powers, proceeded to Scotland, in consequence of words of prophecy spoken to him, to counsel his brethren the clergy of Scotland who should seek to him for counsel. In the fulfilment of this duty he died, expressing to one called to be an Apostle, who was with him *six weeks before* and *at* his death, his perfect conviction of the truth of all that work in which he had taken part. And thus, having done his work, he fell asleep in Jesus, and waits his reward in the day when his own faithful testimony shall be fulfilled, of the doom of *Babylon*, and of the speedy coming of the Lord.”—*Narrative of Events*, p. 36.

Literally, this statement is not inconsistent with truth. The person called to be an apostle, may have been with Irving both *six weeks before*, and *at* his death, and may have heard from him, *six weeks before*, “his perfect conviction of the truth” of the work; but that he heard a similar declaration from him *at* his death, we very much doubt; as, in that case, the unhappy man must, upon his death-bed, have held two opposite kinds of language on

<sup>8</sup> See English Review, vol. ix. pp. 25—40.

the subject. This, except under an impaired state of his faculties, no one, who knew Irving's character, would impute to him ; nor is it necessary to have recourse to such a supposition. The statement which we have quoted does not really affirm that he expressed his conviction of the truth of the work *at* his death, but only that the person to whom he is said to have expressed that conviction, was with him *at* his death, as well as *six weeks before* his death ; leaving it open to the construction, that what is said of his testimony to the truth of the work refers to the last-named period, while the uninformed would naturally enough refer it to both periods, and conclude that Irving died, *which he did not*, unshaken in his belief in the work which goes by his name.

That doubts should arise was, indeed, most natural. The very promise of the restoration of the Apostolic office, given "by utterance" in London, was contradicted, on its being communicated to "the brethren" in Scotland, by the prophets there, likewise speaking "by utterance." The "utterance" in London, which continued to assert the approaching restoration, raised large expectations of a full display of Apostolic powers which never came. The evidence on which the beginning of the work rested was of the most questionable kind ; the Apostles being "called" by the Prophets, and the Prophets "ordained" *ex post facto* by the Apostles. Even this was not achieved without considerable difficulty. A most important circumstance, which in the "*Narrative*" is altogether suppressed, is the fact, which we have good authority for stating, that the first two individuals nominated to the Apostleship,—Mr. Baxter, the "prophet" and author of the disclosures before referred to, and a Mr. D\*\*\*\* D\*\*,—declined the call, and pronounced the whole work to be a delusion and a snare of the devil. But there were others less diffident and less scrupulous. Mr. Drummond, another of the prophets, proceeded to call Mr. John Cardale, who accepted the office, and who for the support which he thereby gave to the tottering cause of Irvingism, was rewarded with the expressive title "Pillar of the Apostles." Nor was Mr. Drummond left without his reward for the decision with which he acted at so critical a moment ; for the next call, proceeding from Mr. Bayford, another of the prophets, raised Mr. Drummond himself to the apostolic office<sup>9</sup>. The cue having been once given, the

<sup>9</sup> We owe an apology to Mr. Henry Drummond for having represented him,—erroneously as we have since ascertained,—as holding the place of "Senior Apostle." The Honourable Member for West Surrey is only second in rank. He yields precedence to Mr. John Cardale, whose claim to the Universal Apostolate has been asserted in opposition to the recent Bull of his rival Pio Nino, in the following

calling of Apostles proceeded rather more rapidly than was quite agreeable to the chiefs of the movement. The prophets in the

document, which we borrow from the columns of the "*John Bull*," leaving to the Editor of that journal the responsibility of its authenticity :—

**"JOHN I., PILLAR OF THE APOSTLES.**

*"In Perpetuam Rei Memoriam.*

"The power of restoring the Universal Church, put forth in these last days in the persons of the Twelve Apostles chosen for that purpose, and endowed with miraculous gifts, of whom I, John, am Senior and the Pillar of them all, has from the beginning filled Our heart with a glorious solicitude for the re-establishment of the Fourfold Ministry, and the increase of its helps and governments, as in all parts of the world, so especially in that famous city in which a spurious Apostolate, which is not an Apostolate, has for ages been set up under colour of a pretended succession from St. Peter the Prince of the Apostles. The fruit of this Our solicitude has been already reaped, not only by other nations and kingdoms, but especially also by the Pontifical States, among whose inhabitants light has begun to take the place of darkness from the time that Evangelists sent forth by Us have visited the benighted countries of Christendom. Among other measures taken by Us with a view to give to the Pontifical States the full benefit of this new revelation and regeneration of the Church, is the 'Testimony' which was addressed by Us in the year 1836 to the then Pope Gregory XVI. to whom We gave due warning of the invalidity of his claim to be the Head of Christendom, bidding him at the same time to submit himself in all due humility to the true Apostolate newly manifested in Us; which We doubt not he did in his heart, albeit he was withheld by the spirit of pride and disobedience from giving unto Us any open and direct token of his submission. And further, when, in the same year, 1836, We divided the Tribes of Christendom between the Apostles, the Princes of the Tribes of Israel, We committed unto one of Our Brethren and Fellow Apostles the care of that part of the world called Italy, including the city of Rome and the Pontifical States.

"And now, having further considered the aspect of religious affairs in those States, in consequence of the evident decay of that spurious system of religion which has been long upheld there under an imperfectly constituted Ministry, and the downfall of the power of the Pope, whose throne is maintained by no spiritual authority appertaining unto him, but simply by the bayonets of the infidel democracy of France, We have thought that the time was come when the true Apostolate and the fourfold Ministry might be formally established in the Pontifical States, in the same manner as has already been done in other countries where the preaching of Our Evangelists has prepared the way for the restoration of the Church in the full efficiency of Apostolic power. For which purpose We did call together Our brethren of the Apostolic College, as likewise the Angels of the Churches in this Our Metropolis, and, after due deliberation had, their decision being in perfect accordance with Our own desire, We have concluded to carry the same into effect.

"Wherefore, after having accurately weighed the whole matter, of Our own motion and certain knowledge, and in the fulness of Our Apostolic power, We order and decree, that in the Pontifical States shall be re-established, according to the primitive order of the Church, the Hierarchy of Apostles and Angels, of Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, and Evangelists; and that the following shall be the Angels of the Churches with the jurisdictions annexed thereto, which by these Our Letters We constitute in the several provinces of the Pontifical States.

"The Throne of the Apostle of Italy, and Pillar of the Angels in that part of the world, shall take its name from the Basilic of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles; and he shall bear rule over all that part of the city of Rome called Trastevere, together with the Delegation of Viterbo and Civita Vecchia, or the Patrimony of St. Peter.



different churches exercised their newly acquired patronage so freely, that it became necessary to revoke their acts. Several persons, called to be "Apostles," were shorn of their new dignity, by a declaration that they had not been called "according to the mind of the Lord;" and none were suffered to retain the Apostolic office but Mr. Cardale and Mr. Drummond, whose position in the sect was such that no man might call in question "the mind of the Lord" concerning them. Spiritual discipline was even brought to bear upon the prophets for their "excesses." as appears from the following statement contained in a narrative published as far back as the year 1838, by one of the seceders from the sect<sup>1</sup>:—

"And he shall have under him in the Pontifical States twelve Angels with their Thrones, to wit:—

"The Angel of St. John of Lateran, over the Southern part of the city of Rome, East of the Tiber, with the Delegation of Frosinone and Ponte-corvo and the Delegation of Benevento.

"The Angel of Sta. Maria Maggiore, over the Northern part of the city of Rome, East of the Tiber, with the Comarca of Rome.

"The Angel of Rieti, over the Delegation of Spoleto and Rieti.

"The Angel of Assisi, over the Delegation of Perugia.

"The Angel of Ascoli, over the Delegation of Fermo and Ascoli.

"The Angel of Loreto, over the Delegation of Macerata and Camerino.

"The Angel of Osimo, over the Delegation of Ancona.

"The Angel of Sinigaglia, over the Delegation of Urbino and Pesaro.

"The Angel of Forlimpopoli, over the Legation of Forli.

"The Angel of Faenza, over the Legation of Ravenna.

"The Angel of Lugo, over the Legation of Ferrara.

"The Angel of Medicina, over the Legation of Bologna.

"Provided always, that We reserve to Ourselves full power to appoint as many more Angels as We shall from time to time see fit, and to settle their Thrones and jurisdictions in such wise as may appear to Us most expedient; Our meaning and intention being that nothing contained in this Our present Bull shall in any way abridge, or derogate from, the fulness of Our Apostolic power to deal with the nations and kingdoms of the earth according to Our own will and pleasure. And further We do hereby abrogate and annul, in the plenitude of Our Apostolic authority, all such Archbishoprics, Bishoprics, and ecclesiastical jurisdictions, as well as all constitutions, privileges, customs, of whatever kind, which may at any time, however remote, and even from time immemorial, have obtained in the Pontifical States; and We hereby authorize the Angels of the Churches whom We have appointed by these presents, to order all things as to them in their wisdom may appear meet, in accordance with the constitution of the Restored Apostolic Church. And We command all the Churches of the Saints in the Pontifical States to give unto the said Angels by Us appointed, the tithe of all that they possess. And if any should, upon the plea of any pretended authority or jurisdiction formerly exercised in those parts, presume to interfere with the execution of this Our Apostolic Decree, or in any wise to let or obstruct the Angels of the Churches in the exercise of their office, We hereby declare null and void any thing which might be attempted, in regard to these matters, contrary to these presents, knowingly or ignorantly, by any authority whatsoever.

"Given at Our Metropolitan Church, in Newman-street, London, on the Feast of St. Crispin, in the eighteenth year of Our Apostolate."

<sup>1</sup> Narrative of Henry John Marks, formerly a Jew. With an introduction. By the Rev. Charles B. Tayler. Hatchard and Son, 1838.

"The acknowledged prophet amongst us was suspended from the prophetical office for the space of many months, and was not allowed to partake of the Lord's Supper, because he called one of the elders to the Apostleship; and another was put down because he had called the other prophet to the Apostleship."

In order to avoid the inconvenience of such promiscuous calls to the Apostleship, it was authoritatively announced that the remaining ten should be called by the mouth of one individual, dignified with the title "Pillar of the Prophets." This "Pillar" appears, his title notwithstanding, to have been one of the most insecure supports of the whole edifice, having been over and over again found a false prophet. As an instance of this, we have been informed that upon one occasion he mistook an American swindler for "a mighty Angel," who was to do "a great work for the Lord" in that country. When Mr. Irving proceeded to Scotland on his last visit to that country, the same "Pillar of the Prophets" declared that he was going forth as "a mighty prophet" to do "a great work for the Lord" in his native land; the result being, that Mr. Irving died there, dispirited and broken-hearted. By the same authority sixty "Evangelists" were called and sent to preach in the streets of London, whose mission was subsequently revoked, and the whole pronounced to have been a work of Satan. The flock were warned at one time not to receive any "word" from his mouth, because "the streams were polluted." One of the prophetesses in the Church in Newman-street, on one occasion, openly denounced him as one who "never had the love of God, and never knew it."

While the authority of the prophets was thus seriously shaken in the person of their "Pillar," that of the Apostles rested on no better or more secure foundation. The constant doctrine, promulgated by authority, at the outset, and for a long time after, was, that the calling of a prophet was not of itself sufficient to constitute a man a minister, but that the laying on of the hands of the Apostles was required, who, it was promised, should be endowed with "the power of the Holy Ghost in mighty signs and wonders." These "mighty signs and wonders," however, never came, and the Church was compelled to content itself, by way of evidence of its divine origin and constitution, with the bare assertion of the originators and leaders themselves, that they were inspired of the Holy Ghost. We are told, it is true, that "the first and second called Apostles, by whom the Apostolic Ministry in conferring ordination was first exercised, always waited to be moved by a sensibly supernatural power of the Holy Ghost, in laying on hands, or performing any other ministerial acts;" but immediately after we have the following curious statement:—

"The supernatural power by which the two senior Apostles were moved at the first in fulfilling Apostolic acts, was one of the many instances in which the Lord graciously *condescended, for a season*, to the weakness and ignorance of those whom He had taken as his instruments."—*Narrative of Events*, p. 34.

So manifest was the disappointment of the promise of the plenitude of miraculous apostolic powers, that, as we learn from the "*Narrative of Events*," one of the "Apostles" themselves had misgivings and doubts as to their right and competency to assume apostolic authority, until they were visited with Pentecostal effusions; and at one time there appears to have been a complete mutiny in the camp. The manner in which this was got over is related in the "*Narrative*," and affords the most striking, though indirect, evidence of the unreality of the whole work, which rests, by the showing of the Apostles themselves, not upon any power which they were enabled to put forth, and thereby to silence the gainsayers, but upon the acquiescence of the subordinate ministers in the position assumed by the Apostles, that acquiescence being enforced by a proceeding the most unapostolic that can well be conceived, the threat of a wholesale resignation;—much after the manner in which Lord John Russell every now and then coerces the House of Commons. This page in the history of the sect is too curious not to be transcribed:—

"While the Apostles were most of them out of England on their duties, the senior Apostle, who had charge of the churches in England, and to whom the discretion was given to summon again the Apostles to England, in case of any thing occurring which required the united acting of the whole Apostolic college, felt himself compelled, about the end of the year 1839, to request the Apostles to return. The necessity for this arose from the mistaken notion of some among the angels of the Churches and ministers attached to the Apostles, as to the true meaning of the opening of the first chapter of Ezekiel, and as to the standing of the Apostles towards, and in connexion with, the other three classes of ministers; the results of which misunderstanding would be a virtual denial of the authority of the Apostles to rule the Church, and its consequences, the undermining of all order and discipline. . . .

"The Apostles returned, according to the summons, about Midsummer, 1840, being recalled from the utmost parts of Europe and from America, having had their preparatory work towards Christendom thus interrupted. On their return, after hearing the report of those things which had taken place, they requested all the angels and the

<sup>2</sup> It was on this occasion that one of the Apostles, a Mr. M\*\*\*\*\*, seceded, on the ground that he could not reconcile to his conscience the exercise of Apostolic power, without any satisfactory evidence of his mission, and without any of the "signs of an Apostle," to support so high-sounding a claim.



ministers of the universal Church to state any matters which they wished to state, to bring up any burdens they had to bring up, and in the fullest and freest manner to lay out their views on the subject of the Apostles' place and standing, of their own relative position towards the Apostles and the Churches. These communications having been received, the Apostles considered them, and after mature deliberation, and with a view to setting at rest for the future all doubt and uncertainty regarding their true position, they proceeded to draw up a declaratory statement of the duties of the Apostleship in its bearing upon the other ministries and the churches. And in submitting this document to the ministers associated with them, and to the angels, they intimated that they were willing either to be set aside, or to continue guiding the churches as the Lord gave them ability; but that on no other terms, on no other principles than those laid down in this document, could they undertake the responsibility of the care and guidance of the Churches. During this period of trial, while men's minds were troubled, and discord gave such opportunity to the devil to work his own work and sow seeds of evil, the Apostles felt it necessary to discontinue the monthly meetings of the Council in London, which had been continued until this time, even though all the Apostles, save the senior Apostle, were absent. And it was also found necessary for the present to dispense with the services of the ministers attached to the Apostles, especially those through whom all communications between them and the Churches were made; and further to intimate, that until all erroneous notions in the minds of any of these ministers regarding the discernment and true meaning of the words which had been spoken through the Prophets should be removed, the Apostles could not repose full confidence in them, and that they should for the present refrain from making use of any words of prophecy which might be spoken. The adoption of these measures by the Apostles resulted from the conviction that in such a serious state of things they must act independently, and, by a firm adherence to those principles and doctrines of truth of which they were the only depositaries and declarers, must either save the Church and bring back those who had been led astray, or be themselves the sacrifice for the sake of that which they knew to be the truth. God gave grace to the ministers generally, to see and acknowledge the truth of these principles so laid down by the Apostles, and the ministers and angels of the Churches were gradually instructed more perfectly in the true bearing and duties of the apostolic office; and at length (not without much difficulty) were they fully delivered from the error which had prevailed among them, and which had well-nigh caused the breaking up of the work which had, with so much labour and pains, been thus far carried on. Words of prophecy were spoken, showing the analogy between Aaron's sin in making a calf when Moses was away, and the sin of setting up a subordinate ministry in the place of the Apostleship<sup>3</sup>. —*Narrative of Events*, pp. 80—82.

<sup>3</sup> The reader should compare with this the statement from "Baxter's Narrative"

By way of accounting for the difficulty, the following "note" is appended :—

"By much experience, by light of prophecy, and by the instruction contained in the epistle to the Corinthians, the Apostles had learned, that in the prophetic ministry, as in all other forms of ministry, the purity of the word spoken depended upon the inward cleanness of the individual, and that those whom the Lord was using ought to put away all filthiness of flesh and spirit. And they were also shown, that when a prophet or other minister was in an unclean state, no use could be made of his word or ministry ; for, where the inside of the vessel is unclean, whatsoever is put into it is polluted. And 'who can cleanse dirty water?'"—*Narrative of Events*, p. 81.

The manifest deficiency of evidence to support the claim of the Irvingite sect to a revival of "Apostolic powers" for the introduction of a new dispensation preparatory to the second Advent of Christ, has not escaped the rival "Apostles" of the Mormonites, one of whom, in urging "the presumptive evidences of Joseph Smith's divine mission," thus alludes to the point :—

"Did Irving's apostles—or did any other impostors during the long age of darkness—profess that the apostleship was conferred upon them by those who held it last—by any angel who held the office himself? No ; and therefore they are not apostles, but deceivers. If Mr. Smith had pretended that he received the apostleship by the revelation of the Holy Ghost, without an ordination under the hands of an apostle, we should at once know that his pretensions were vain, and that he was a deceiver. If an impostor, how came Mr. Smith to discover this? Why did he not, like the Irvingites, assume the apostleship without an apostle to ordain him? How came he to possess so much more wisdom than Irving, as to discover that he could not be an apostle without being ordained under the hands of an apostle? If Mr. Smith be a false apostle, it must be confessed that he has exhibited far more judgment than all the false apostles who have preceded him, learned and talented as they were."—*Orson Pratt's Divine Authority*, p. 5.

Leaving the "Apostles" of the Irvingite sect to establish their claim to the apostleship in the best way they can, to the satisfaction of their Mormonite brethren, we now turn to the examination of the evidence by which the latter support their apostleship. As far as the evidence boasted of in the above passage is concerned, we are at a loss to discover its superiority,—except in point of impudence,—over that adduced by the Irvingites, seeing that on examination it reduces itself to a simple asseveration on the part of the "Apostle" and "Prophet," Joseph Smith himself,

(pp. 85, 85), quoted in our former article on this subject, "English Review," vol. ix. p. 40.

whose testimony to his own commission and ordination is thus recounted by one of his "Apostles:"—

"In what manner does Joseph Smith declare that a dispensation of the gospel was committed unto him? He testifies that an angel of God, whose name was Moroni, appeared unto him; that this angel was formerly an ancient prophet among a remnant of the tribe of Joseph on the continent of America. He testifies that Moroni revealed unto him where he deposited the sacred records of his nation some fourteen hundred years ago; that these records contained the "everlasting gospel" as it was anciently taught and recorded by this branch of Israel. He gave Mr. Smith power to reveal the contents of those records to the nations of the earth. Now how does this testimony of Joseph Smith agree with the book of John's prophecy given on the Isle of Patmos? John testifies that, when the dispensation of the gospel is again committed to the nations, it shall be through the medium of an *angel* from heaven. J. Smith testifies that a dispensation of the gospel for all nations has been committed to him by an *angel*. The one uttered the prediction; the other testifies its fulfilment." . . .

"A revelation and restoration to the earth of the '*everlasting gospel*' through the angel Moroni would be of no benefit to the nations, unless some one should be ordained with authority to preach it and administer its ordinances. Moroni might reveal a book containing a beautiful and glorious system of salvation, but no one could obey even its first principles without a legally authorized administrator, ordained to preach, baptize, lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, &c. Did Moroni ordain Mr. Smith to the apostleship, and command him to administer ordinances? No, he did not. But why not confer authority by ordination, as well as reveal the everlasting gospel? Because in all probability he had not the right so to do. All angels have not the same authority—they do not all hold the same keys. Moroni was a prophet, but we have no account of his holding the office of an apostle; and, if not, he had no right to ordain Mr. Smith to an office which he himself never possessed. He no doubt went as far as he was authorized, and that was to reveal the '*stick of Ephraim*'—the record of his fathers, containing the '*everlasting gospel*.' How then did Mr. Smith obtain the office of an apostle, if Moroni had no authority to ordain him to such office? Mr. Smith testifies that Peter, James, and John came to him in the capacity of ministering angels, and by the laying on of hands ordained him an apostle, and commanded him to preach, baptize, lay on hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, and administer all other ordinances of the gospel as they themselves did in ancient days." —*Orson Pratt's Divine Authority*, pp. 4, 5.

Here we have it plainly enough stated, by what evidence the "Apostolic powers" of the Mormon "Church" are attested; and, provided we can put perfect faith in the word of Joseph Smith, there can be no mistake about the matter. There is, it is true,



according to "Apostle" Pratt's statement, the additional evidence of numerous miracles, wrought both by Joseph Smith himself and by his successors in the apostolic office :—

"The miracles wrought by Joseph Smith are evidences of no small moment to establish his divine authority. In the name of the Lord he cast out devils, healed the sick, spoke with new tongues, interpreted ancient languages, and predicted future events. Many of these miracles were wrought before numerous multitudes of both believers and unbelievers, and upon persons not connected with our church. And, again, the numerous miracles wrought through the instrumentality of thousands of the officers and members of this church are additional evidences that the man who was instrumental in founding the church *must have been sent of God*. The thousands of sick that have been miraculously healed in all parts of the world where this gospel is preached give forth a strong and almost irresistible testimony that Mr. Smith's authority is '*from heaven*.'"—*Orson Pratt's Divine Authority*, p. 14.

Unfortunately, however, for the conclusiveness of this evidence, there happens to be no record or attestation of these miracles extant beyond the allegations of the Mormonites themselves; and even these consist merely of vague and general statements like the present, carefully avoiding all mention of *names, dates, and places*, on which issue might be joined. Not that miracle-mongery is not, when opportunity serves, practised by the sect, and that to a very daring extent, if there is any truth in the following story related by Joseph Smith's *quondam* coadjutor, General Bennett, who gives as his authority the name of an American minister, the Rev. M. Turner :—

"Towards the close of a fine summer's day, a farmer in one of the States found a respectable-looking man at his gate, who requested permission to pass the night under his roof. The hospitable farmer readily complied; the stranger was invited into the house, and a warm and substantial supper set before him.

"After he had eaten, the farmer, who appeared to be a jovial, contented, humorous, and, withal, shrewd old man, passed several hours in pleasant conversation with his guest, who seemed to be very ill at ease, both in body and mind; yet, as if desirous of pleasing his entertainer, replied continuously and agreeably to whatever was said to him. Finally, he pleaded fatigue and illness, as an excuse for retiring to rest, and was conducted by the farmer to an upper chamber, where he went to bed.

"About the middle of the night, the farmer and his family were aroused by the most dreadful groans, which they soon ascertained proceeded from the chamber of the traveller. On going to investigate the matter, they found that the stranger was dreadfully ill, suffering the most acute pain, and uttering the most doleful cries, apparently without

any consciousness of what was passing around him. Every thing that kindness and experience could suggest was done to relieve the sick man; but all efforts were in vain, and, to the consternation of the farmer and his family, their guest expired in the course of a few hours.

"In the midst of their trouble and anxiety, at an early hour in the evening, two travellers came to the gate, and requested entertainment. The farmer told them that he would willingly offer them hospitality, but that just now his household was in the greatest confusion, on account of the death of the stranger, the particulars of which he proceeded to relate to them. They appeared to be much surprised and grieved at the poor man's calamity, and politely requested permission to see the corpse. This, of course, the farmer readily granted, and conducted them to the chamber in which lay the dead body. They looked at it for a few minutes in silence, and then the oldest of the pair gravely told the farmer, that they were Elders of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, and were empowered by God to perform miracles, even to the extent of raising the dead; and that they felt quite assured they could bring to life the dead man before them.

"The farmer was, of course, pretty considerably astonished by the quality and powers of the persons who addressed him, and rather incredulously asked, if they were quite sure that they could perform all they professed to do.

"'Oh, certainly! not a doubt of it. The Lord has commissioned us expressly to work miracles, in order to prove the truth of the Prophet Joseph Smith, and the inspiration of the books and doctrines revealed to him. Send for all your neighbours, that in the presence of a multitude we may bring the dead man to life, and that the Lord in his Church may be glorified to all men.'

"The farmer, after a little consideration, agreed to let the miracle-workers proceed, and, as they desired, sent his children to his neighbours, who, attracted by the expectation of a miracle, flocked to the house in considerable numbers.

"The Mormon elders commenced their task by kneeling and praying before the body with uplifted hands and eyes, and with most stentorian lungs. Before they had proceeded far into their prayer, a sudden idea struck the farmer, who quietly quitted the house for a few minutes, and then returned and waited patiently by the bed-side until the prayer was finished, and the elders ready to perform the miracle. Before they began, he respectfully said to them, that, with their permission, he wished to ask them a few questions upon the subject of their miracle. They replied that they had no objection. The farmer then asked, 'You are quite certain that you can bring this man to life again?' 'We are.' 'How do you know that you can?' 'We have just received a revelation from the Lord, informing us that we can.' 'Are you quite sure that the revelation was from the Lord?' 'Yes: we cannot be mistaken about it.' 'Does your power to raise this man to life again depend upon the particular nature of his disease, or could you now bring any dead man to life?' 'It makes no difference to us;

we could bring any corpse to life.' 'Well, if this man had been killed, and one of his arms cut off, could you bring him to life, and also restore to him his arm?' 'Certainly, there is no limit to the power given us by the Lord. It would make no difference, even if both his arms and his legs were cut off.' 'Could you restore him, if his head had been cut off?' 'Certainly we could.' 'Well,' said the farmer, with a quiet smile upon his features, 'I do not doubt the truth of what such holy men assert; but I am desirous that my neighbours here should be fully converted by having the miracle performed in the completest manner possible. So, by your leave, if it makes no difference whatever, I will proceed to cut off the head of this corpse.' Accordingly, he produced a large and well-sharpened broad axe from beneath his coat, which he swung above his head, and was apparently about to bring it down upon the neck of the corpse, when, lo, and behold! to the amazement of all present, the dead man started up in great agitation, and swore he would not have his head cut off for any consideration whatever!

"The company immediately seized the Mormons, and soon made them confess that the pretended dead man was also a Mormon elder, and that they had sent him to the farmer's house, with directions to die there at a particular hour, when they would drop in, as if by accident, and perform a miracle that would astonish every body. The farmer, after giving the impostors a severe chastisement, let them depart to practise their humbuggery in some other quarter."

Attempts at imposture of so daring a character are not, we apprehend, of frequent occurrence; but that tricks are resorted to for the purpose of deceiving the ignorant, both in the "Far West," and, we fear, in the darker districts of our own country, is far from improbable; and it would be little short of a miracle, if they were not occasionally successful. Generally speaking, however, the emissaries of Mormonism are remarkably cautious in feeling their ground, before they assert their possession of miraculous powers; and, on a recent occasion, when they were encountered by a clergyman of the English Church, the author of the "*Friendly Warnings*" (No. 8, at the head of this article), they actually disclaimed the possession of any such power. Being asked, "Can you work miracles in proof of your commission from God?" they replied, "*We cannot work miracles to prove that we are commissioned by the Holy Ghost.*"

As we have in a former article on this subject<sup>4</sup> furnished our readers with ample materials for testing the claim of Joseph Smith and his followers to miraculous attestations of the divine origin of their sect, we shall not dwell on this point any further, but proceed to notice, as another point of coincidence between

<sup>4</sup> *English Review*, vol. xiii. pp. 399.



the delusion of the Irvingites and that of the Mormonites, the remarkable fact that the latter no less than the former, shrink from resting their claim to men's faith in their work on the evidence of miracles, and point to their doctrine as furnishing more conclusive proofs of the truth of their work. The very same "Apostle" who vaunts the miracles of Joseph Smith, and of "thousands of the officers and members of the Church," as proofs of their divine mission, takes exception to the conclusiveness of miraculous evidence :—

"Although the great majority of mankind consider miracles to be an *infallible* evidence in favour of the divine authority of the one who performs them, yet we do most distinctly dissent from this idea. If miracles be admitted as an *infallible* evidence, then all that have ever wrought miracles must have been sent of God. The magicians of Egypt wrought some splendid miracles before that nation; they created serpents and frogs, and turned rivers of water into blood. If miraculous evidence is *infallible*, the Egyptians were bound to receive the contradictory messages of both Moses and the magicians as of divine authority. According to this idea, the witch of Endor must have established her divine mission beyond all controversy by calling forth a dead man from the grave in the presence of Saul, king of Israel. A certain wicked power described by John (Rev. xiii. chap.) was to do 'great wonders' and 'miracles,' and cause 'fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men.' If miracles are infallible evidences, surely no one should reject the divine authority of John's beast. Again (in Rev. xvi. chap.) John 'saw three unclean spirits like frogs,' which he expressly says, 'are the SPIRITS OF DEVILS WORKING MIRACLES, which go forth unto the kings of the earth, and of the whole world to gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty.' The learned divines and clergy of the nineteenth century boldly declare that '*miracles are an INFALLIBLE evidence of the divine mission of the one who performs them.*' If so, who can blame '*the kings of the earth,*' and these learned divines, and all their followers for embracing the message of these divinely inspired devils? For, according to their arguments, they should in no wise reject them, for they prove their mission by evidences which they say are infallible. We shall expect, in a few years, to see an innumerable host of sectarian ministers, as well as kings, taking up their line of march for the great valley of 'Armageddon,' near Jerusalem, and thus prove by their works that they do really believe in the *infallibility of miraculous evidence*. Devils can work miracles as well as God, and as they have already persuaded the religious world that miracles are infallible evidences of divine authority, they will not have much difficulty among the followers of modern christianity in establishing the divinity of their mission. But the 'Latter-Day Saints' do not believe in the infallibility of miraculous evidence. We believe the miraculous gifts are absolutely necessary in the church of Christ, without which it cannot exist on the earth. Mira-

cles, when taken in connexion with a *pure, holy, and perfect doctrine, reasonable and scriptural*, is a very strong collateral evidence in favour of that doctrine, and of the divine authority of those who preach it. But abstract miracles alone, unconnected with other evidences, instead of being *infallible* proofs are no proofs at all; they are as likely to be *false* as true.”—Orson Pratt’s *Divine Authority*, pp. 14, 15.

The test here proposed, viz. the character of the doctrine, whether it be “pure, holy, perfect, reasonable, and scriptural,” is undoubtedly one which cannot fail to commend itself to every Christian mind. Whether that test applied to the writings of “Apostle” Pratt himself, and of his brother “Apostles” and “Evangelists,” tells in favour of the Mormonite doctrine, is another question; one which a very few extracts from their writings will set at rest. We need not, for this purpose, enter into recondite questions of theology; the language,—almost too horrible to transcribe,—which is held respecting the three persons of the Ever-blessed Trinity, is conclusive as to the character of the Mormonite doctrine. We shall begin by quoting part of one of Orson Spencer’s letters, entitled “The true and living God:”—

“A very general conviction concerning the character of God now is, that He is a Being without body, or parts, or passions. A greater absurdity cannot be furnished in all the annals of heathenism. Even images of wood, and brass, and stone are scarcely more remote from the picture of the true God, than the theory of a passionless, matterless God—an inconceivable sort of chaotic being, that is without form, or void, (*sic!*) or dwelling-place! a being whose circumference is every where, and his centre no where!

“Another theory concerning God, that is entertained by Jewish Rabbies, though of an opposite character, is not much more extravagant than the common orthodox theory, viz., the Rabbies suppose that God is a Being of some ‘*millions of miles in length.*’

“Again, the popular notion of modern Jews, as expressed in a recent number of the *Jewish Chronicle*, is, that the Almighty God is a Being of such infinite *dimension*, that He cannot *condense* Himself sufficiently to speak to men, or be tangible or visible by mortals. Accordingly, when He gives revelation to men, He creates a fictitious or imaginary messenger, through whom He communicates his will, and this messenger has no real existence in the eye of God, and *only* in the momentary perception of the person addressed.

“From the foregoing it may be seen how grossly ignorant both Jews and Christians are of the person of God, the Creator and Saviour of the world! All this, too, in an age of the world boasting of blazing light! of a millennial dawn! of the unparalleled march of improvement! but, alas! the very God and Father of us all, who ought to be *truly* known in order to be rightly worshipped, is regarded as the most

insensible (a God without '*passion*' must be insensible), and irrational, and unattractive as to form, of all beings that can be conceived of; and the most surprising feature in all modern theology in an age of sanity is, that this notion concerning the person of God, is deducible from the scriptures of the Old and New Testament.

"The New Testament tells us most unequivocally what kind of person God has, and whether He is a Being having both passion and physical form. It tells us whether He can be so '*condensed*' as to speak to men, and be seen of them, and talk to them face to face, as a man talks to his fellow man. The New Testament declares that in Jesus Christ dwelt the '**FULNESS OF THE GODHEAD BODILY.**'

"Now, if the Godhead dwelt in the body of Christ, then it is certain that God is not without a *body*. But He has a body; and what is his body like unto? The New Testament tells us what his body is like. It is so nearly and exactly like unto the body of Christ, that there is no difference. Paul says, that Christ was the '*express image of his person.*' It is then beyond all dispute that the body and person of Jesus Christ and the Father are alike. Language cannot express the similitude of the Father and the Son in plainer or stronger terms. Then, if we can show from the New Testament what kind of body or person Jesus Christ had, we can also tell what kind of body the Father has, because they are alike. One is the express image of the other. If one has a fleshy material body, the other has the same. If one resembles in stature the seed of the woman, the other also wears the same resemblance. If one can be so '*condensed*' as to speak and walk, and feel and act like a man, the other can do the same. If one wearing a body of flesh and bones, in all points like unto his brethren, is capable of holding all power in heaven and earth, and also of displaying the brightness of celestial glory, the other can do the same in a similar body of flesh and bones.

"Well, now, what kind of body or person had Jesus Christ, which looked so much like the Father's person? Was it an airy, invisible, evanescent, mystical *nothing*, which some would denominate spirit? No, by no means; very much otherwise. Hearken now, my dear Sir, and all ye readers, that have an honest desire to *know* the living and true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, in order that men might know from the person of the Son what is the personal appearance of the Father. He, '*the Word, was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.*' Jesus had a fleshy form like the seed of Abraham, and being begotten of the Father He partook of his likeness. Men beheld his glory in human form, and Paul says that his glory was the glory of the Father.

"It appears from the conduct of some of his disciples, that they, like sectarian churches now, were tintured with the idea that Christ, after his death and resurrection, was purely and exclusively a *Spirit*; but He tells them to handle Him and see that '*a Spirit has not flesh and bones as ye see me have.*' And He eat and drank with them as



aforetime with his resurrected body, and afterwards ascended up from their midst with the same bloodless body into heaven; and in like manner will He come again.

"Thus, Sir, the notion of a God that is exclusively *Spirit* without bodily form, was banished from the minds of the disciples that saw the bodily image of the Father in the person of the Son after his resurrection. From heaven He will come again in like manner, and every eye shall see Him, and they that have pierced Him. But the popular God of modern times, that has no body or parts, cannot be seen. But, Sir, this popular God that has sprung into fashion, since the age of revelation, has no resemblance to Jesus Christ, who has both body and parts, and is the exact image of his Father. Jesus Christ declared that He could exercise all power in heaven and earth while He was in the body. His Father could do the same, because they were alike. It required no extraordinary *condensation* of the infinity of Jesus in order to reveal Himself to men, or in order that men should behold his glory."—*Orson Spencer's Letters*, pp. 99—103.

The same writer, in another letter, entitled "The Gift of the Holy Ghost," thus speaks of the descent of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost:—

"If you will honestly listen to my description of the office-work of the Holy Ghost, you will clearly perceive, that, since the time Jesus left the earth, it is more extensive and important than even the work of the other personages of the Godhead.

"The Holy Ghost performs the double office of a WITNESS on earth and a RECORDER in heaven. Being an unembodied personage, He can move among men without the danger of being mobbed and killed, as was not the case with Jesus Christ. He takes up the work of man's redemption, just where Jesus Christ left it, and has a distinct part to act until the second coming of Christ, that in due time He also may obtain glory with the Father, even as Jesus does—yea, a fulness of the Godhead by Himself.

"According to promise He came on the day of Pentecost, either with a retinue of sanctified spirits, or in the simple unity and grandeur of his own potent agency, and filled the house. He then disbursed among the disciples a variety of tongues—gifts for men which the Conqueror had promised. With the keys of revelation, peculiar to his office, He unlocked their understanding (with perfect impunity to Himself) and bore witness that Jesus was Christ."—*Orson Spencer's Letters*, pp. 64, 65.

We next turn to a passage in Orson Pratt's "*Kingdom of God*," in which he accounts for the alleged extinction of the Christian Church, or, as he expresses it, for the fact that the people "have not heard one word" from the King of the Kingdom "for upwards of seventeen hundred years:—

"I will now tell you the reason why the King has kept silence so

long. It is because he has had no subjects to converse with; all have turned away from him and advocated other governments, as being the rightful and legal authority. They killed off and utterly destroyed every true subject of His kingdom, and left not a vestige of it upon the earth; and, to add to their guilt and wickedness, they have introduced idolatry in its worst forms, and utterly turned away from the true and living God. They have introduced a "*God without BODY or PASSIONS.*" They have had the audacity to call this newly-invented god by the same name as the God of the ancient saints, although there is not the least resemblance between them. Indeed, there could be no resemblance between them; for a bodiless god, without '*parts or passions,*' could resemble nothing in heaven, on earth, or in hell. This imaginary modern god has become exceedingly popular. It is to him that a vast number of churches have been erected. It is not to the true and living God that they send forth petitions, but it is to this imaginary being. No wonder that they have received no communication from him; no wonder that he has not honoured them with a visit. As he has no '*PARTS,*' he could neither be felt nor seen if he should visit them. Such a being could not speak, for he has no '*parts*' to speak with.

"There have been various species of idolatry in different ages of the world. The sun, moon, stars, beasts, crocodiles, frightful serpents, images of wood, of stone, and of brass, have been erected into gods, and worshipped by innumerable multitudes. But the system of idolatry invented by modern Christianity far surpasses in absurdity any thing that we have ever heard of. One of the celebrated worshippers of this newly-discovered god, in his '*Physical Theory of another life,*' says, '*A disembodied spirit, or, we should rather say, an unembodied spirit, or sheer mind, is NOWHERE. Place is a relation belonging to extension, and extension is a property of matter; but that which is wholly abstracted from matter, and, in speaking of which, we deny that it has any property in common therewith, can in itself be subject to none of its conditions; and we might as well say of a pure spirit that it is hard, heavy, or red, or that it is a cubic foot in dimensions, as say that it is here or there.*' It is only in a popular and improper sense that any such affirmation is made concerning the Infinite Spirit, or that we speak of God as *every where* present. God is in every place in a sense altogether incomprehensible by finite minds, inasmuch as his relation to space and extension is peculiar to infinitude. Using the terms as we use them of ourselves, God is not *here* or *there*, any more than he exists *now* and *then.*' This species of idolatry, according to the foregoing quotations, approaches so near to Atheism, that no one can tell the difference. Reader, can you see the difference? A god '*without a body!*' A god '*without parts!*' A god that cannot be '*here or there!*' A god that is '*NO WHERE!*' A god that cannot exist '*NOW and THEN!*' A god that exists in NO TIME! A god that has no *extension*—no '*parts*'—no conceivable relation to *time* or *space!* O, blush for modern Christianity!—a pious name for Atheism! Some, perhaps, may think that I have not sufficient charity. But why should I have charity for a god

that has no '*parts*'—no relation to space? Let him first have charity for himself. But this would be impossible, for he is a god '*without passions.*' He can have no charity nor love for himself nor any one else. There is no danger of offending him, for a passionless god is not capable of anger. One of the persons of this imaginary god is said to have been crucified; but this must be a sad mistake, for it would be impossible to crucify a portion of something that had no '*parts.*' The reason, then, why the people have not received any word from the Great King, is because they have petitioned the wrong god. Would you expect her Majesty, the queen of England, to answer your petition if it was directed to some African prince? Would you expect the God of heaven to answer a petition that was addressed to a Hindoo god? If, then, your petitions are addressed to the bodiless, passionless god of modern Christianity, you must not be surprised if the true God does not pay any attention to them. You need not expect that the true God will make any reply to petitions offered to any other being.

"The true God exists both in time and in space, and has as much relation to them as man or any other being. He has extension, and form, and dimensions, as well as man. He occupies space; has a body, parts, and passions; can go from place to place: can eat, drink, and talk, as well as man. Man resembles Him in the features and form of his body; and He does not differ materially in size. When He has been seen among men, He has been pronounced, even by the wicked, as one of their own species. So much did He look like man, that some supposed Him to be the carpenter's son. Like man, He had a father; and He was the '*express image of the person of the Father.*' The two Persons were as much alike in form, in size, and in every other respect, as fathers and sons are of the human race; indeed, the human race are '*His offspring,*' made in His likeness and image; not after His moral image, but after the image of His person. There is no such thing as moral image; such an image cannot exist. Morality is a property of some being or substance. A property without a substance or being to which it appertains, is inconceivable. A property can never have figure, shape, or image of any kind. Hence a moral image never had an existence except in the brains of modern idolaters.

"The Godhead consists of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The Father is a material being. The substance of which He is composed is wholly material. It is a substance widely different, in some respects, from the various substances with which we are more immediately acquainted. In other respects it is precisely like all other materials. The substance of His person occupies space, the same as other matter. It has solidity, length, breadth, and thickness, like all other matter. The elementary materials of His body are not susceptible of occupying, at the same time, the same identical space with other matter. The substance of His person, like other matter, cannot be in two places at the same instant. It also requires *time* for Him to transport Himself from place to place. It matters not how great the velocity of His movements, *time* is an essential ingredient to all motion,



whether rapid or slow. It differs from other matter in the superiority of its powers, being intelligent, all-wise, and possessing the power of self-motion to a far greater extent than the coarser materials of nature. 'God is a *spirit*.' But that does not make Him an immaterial being—a being that has no properties in common with matter. The expression, '*an immaterial being*,' is a contradiction in terms. Immateriality is only another name for nothing; it is the negative of all existence. A '*spirit*' is as much *matter* as oxygen or hydrogen. It has many properties in common with all other matter. Chemists have discovered between fifty and sixty kinds of matter; and each kind has some properties in common with all other matter, and some properties peculiar to itself, which the others do not inherit. Now, no chemist, in classifying his substances, would presume to say, 'This substance is material, but that one is immaterial, because it differs in some respects from the first.' He would call them all material, though they in some respects differed widely. So the substance called spirit is material, though it differs in a remarkable degree from other substances. It is only the addition of another element of a more powerful nature than any yet discovered. He is not a being 'without *parts*,' as modern idolators teach; for every whole is made up of parts. The whole person of the Father consists of innumerable parts; and each part is so situated, as to bear certain relations of distance to every other part. There must also be, to a certain degree, a freedom of motion among these parts; which is an essential condition to the movement of His limbs, without which He could only move as a whole.

"All the foregoing statements in relation to the person of the Father, are equally applicable to the person of the Son."—*Orson Pratt's Kingdom of God*, Part I., pp. 3, 4.

Concerning the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, the same writer declares:—

"The Holy Spirit being one part of the Godhead, is also a material substance, of the same nature and properties in many respects, as the spirits of the Father and Son. It exists in vast immeasurable quantities in connexion with all material worlds. This is called God in the Scriptures, as well as the Father and Son. God the Father and God the Son cannot be every where present; indeed they cannot be even in two places at the same instant: but God the Holy Spirit is omnipresent—it extends through all space, intermingling with all other matter, yet no one atom of the Holy Spirit can be in two places at the same instant, which in all cases is an absolute impossibility. It must exist in inexhaustible quantities, which is the only possible way for any substance to be omnipresent. All the innumerable phenomena of universal nature are produced in their origin by the actual presence of this intelligent, all-wise, and all-powerful material substance called the Holy Spirit. It is the most active matter in the universe, producing all its operations according to fixed and definite laws enacted by itself, in conjunction with the Father and Son. What are called the laws of

nature are nothing more nor less than the fixed method by which this spiritual matter operates. Each atom of the Holy Spirit is intelligent, and like all other matter has solidity, form, and size, and occupies space. Two atoms of this Spirit cannot occupy the same space at the same time, neither can one atom, as before stated, occupy two separate spaces at the same time. In all these respects it does not differ in the least from all other matter. Its distinguishing characteristics from other matter are its almighty powers and infinite wisdom, and many other glorious attributes which other materials do not possess. If several of the atoms of this Spirit should unite themselves together into the form of a person, then this person of the Holy Spirit would be subject to the same necessity as the other two persons of the Godhead, that is, it could not be every where present. No finite number of atoms can be omnipresent. An infinite number of atoms is requisite to be *every where* in infinite space. Two persons receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit, do not each receive at the same time the same identical particles, though they each receive a substance exactly similar in kind. It would be as impossible for each to receive the same identical atoms at the same instant, as it would be for two men at the same time to drink the same identical pint of water.”—*Orson Pratt's Kingdom of God*. Part I., pp. 4, 5.

And in his “*Absurdities of Immaterialism*,” he endeavours to prove, that “*Immaterialists are Atheists*,” by the following train of reasoning, if reasoning it can be called :—

“There are two classes of Atheists in the world. One class denies the existence of God in the most positive language: the other denies his existence in duration or space. One says, ‘There is no God;’ the other says, ‘God is not *here* or *there*, any more than he exists *now* and *then*.’ The infidel says, God does not exist any where. The Immaterialist says, ‘He exists *No where*.’ The infidel says, There is no such substance as God. The Immaterialist says, There is such a substance as God, but it is ‘*without Parts*.’ The Atheist says, There is no such substance as *Spirit*. The Immaterialist says, ‘A spirit, though he lives and acts, occupies no room, and fills no space, in the same way and after the same manner as matter, not even so much as does the minutest grain of sand.’ The Atheist does not seek to hide his infidelity; but the Immaterialist, whose declared belief amounts to the same thing as the Atheist’s, endeavours to hide his infidelity under the shallow covering of a few words.

“The ‘thinking principle,’ says Dr. Thomas Brown, ‘is essentially one, not extended and divisible, but incapable by its very nature, of any subdivision into integral parts.’ What is this but the rankest kind of infidelity couched in a blind, plausible form. That which is ‘not extended and not divisible’ and ‘without parts,’ cannot be any thing else than nothing. Take away these qualities and conditions, and no power of language can give us the least idea of existence. The very idea conveyed by the term existence is something extended, divisible, and

with parts. Take these away, and you take away existence itself. It cannot be so much as the negative of space, or, what is generally called, an indivisible point, for that has a relation to the surrounding spaces. It cannot be so much as the negative of duration, or, what is generally called, an indivisible instant, for that has a relation to the past and future. Therefore, it must be the negative of all existence, or, what is called absolutely **NOTHING**. Nothing, and nothing only, is a representative of that which has no relation to space or time—that is, unextended, indivisible, and without parts. Therefore, the Immaterialist is a religious Atheist; he only differs from the other class of Atheists, by clothing an indivisible unextended **NOTHING** with the powers of a god. One class believes in no God; the other class believes that **NOTHING** is God, and worships it as such. There is no twisting away from this. The most profound philosopher in all the ranks of modern Christianity, cannot extricate the Immaterialist from atheism. He cannot show the least difference between the idea represented by the word *nothing*, and the idea represented by that which is unextended, indivisible, and without parts, having no relation to space or time. All the philosophers of the universe could not give a better or more correct definition of *Nothing*. And yet this is the god worshipped by the Church of England—the Methodists—and millions of other atheistical idolators, according to their own definitions, as recorded in their respective articles of faith. An open Atheist is not so dangerous as the Atheist who couches his atheistical doctrines under the head of “ARTICLES OF RELIGION.” The first stands out with open colours, and boldly avows his infidelity; the latter, under the sacred garb of religion, draws into his yawning vortex the unhappy millions who are persuaded to believe in and worship an unextended indivisible *nothing* without parts, deified into a god. A pious Atheist is much more serviceable in building up the kingdom of darkness than one who openly, and without any deception, avows his infidelity.

“No wonder that this modern god has wrought no miracles and given no revelations since his followers invented their ‘Articles of Religion.’ A being without parts must be entirely powerless, and can perform no miracles. Nothing can be communicated from such a being; for, if nothing give nothing, nothing will be received. If, at death, his followers are to be made like him, they will enjoy, with some of the modern Pagans, all the beauties of annihilation. To be made like him! Admirable thought! How transcendantly sublime to behold an innumerable multitude of unextended nothings, casting their crowns at the feet of the great, inextended, infinite Nothing, filling all space, and yet ‘without parts!’ There will be no danger of quarrelling for want of room: for the Rev. David James says, ‘Ten thousand spirits might be brought together into the smallest compass imaginable, and there exist without any inconvenience for want of room. As materiality,’ continues he, ‘forms no property of a spirit, the space which is sufficient for one, must be amply sufficient for myriads, yea, for all that exist.’ According to this, all the spirits that exist, ‘could be brought together



into the smallest compass imaginable,' or, in other words, into no compass at all; for, he says, a spirit occupies 'no room, and fills no space.' What an admirable description of Nothing! *Nothing* 'occupies no room, and fills no space!' If myriads of Nothings were 'brought together into the smallest compass imaginable,' they could 'there exist without any inconvenience for want of room.' Every thing which the Immaterialist says, of the existence of *spirit*, will apply, without any variation, to the existence of *Nothing*. If he says that his god cannot exist '*Here*' or '*There*,' the same is true of *Nothing*. If he affirms that he cannot exist '*Now*' and '*Then*,' the same can, in all truth, be affirmed of *Nothing*. If, he declares, that he is '*unextended*,' so is *Nothing*. If he asserts that he is '*indivisible*' and '*without parts*,' so is *Nothing*. If he declares that a spirit 'occupies no room and fills no space,' neither does *Nothing*. If he says a spirit is '*Nowhere*,' so is *Nothing*. All that he affirms of the one, can, in like manner, and, with equal truth, be affirmed of the other. Indeed, they are only two words, each of which express precisely the same idea. There is no more absurdity in calling *Nothing* a substance, and clothing it with Almighty powers, than there is in making a substance out of that which is precisely like nothing, and imagining it to have Almighty powers. Therefore, an immaterial god is a deified Nothing, and all his worshippers are atheistical idolators."—*Orson Pratt's Absurdities of Immaterialism*, pp. 11, 12.

Such are the horrible tenets of Mormonism. No argument is needed to show that they are not "pure, holy, perfect, reasonable, and scriptural." Upon the very face of them they are as false and blasphemous, as the claim of Joseph Smith to be a Prophet of the living God. We should have hesitated to pollute our pages with them, but for the knowledge which we have of the activity of the missionaries of the Mormon sect in various parts both of England and Wales, and the consequent necessity of arousing the attention of the clergy to its real character. It is with this view chiefly, that we determined to resume the subject; and, with the same view, we cannot do better than recommend, both for perusal and for distribution in localities in which it may be needed, the excellent and able Tract, entitled "*Friendly Warnings on the subject of Mormonism*," which originated in the invasion of a country parish by emissaries of Mormonism. To put a stop to the mischief, the Clergyman of the parish resorted to the simple and straightforward course of obtaining an interview with the preachers, two Mormon priests, in the course of which he elicited from them, by a series of well-framed questions, a statement of their doctrines, which he took down in writing, and obtained their signatures to it, in attestation of its correctness. As it forms a compendious abstract of the leading errors of the sect, we give it insertion:—

"I. What do you think of the Baptism of Infants?

"We think it absurd, unlawful, and without proof from Scripture, but contrary to the Word of God.

"Do you consider all Infant Baptisms performed in the Church of England null and void? Do you say the same of the baptisms of Dissenters and of Roman Catholics?

"Yes, we do.

"III. What do you think of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper?

"We use bread and water, and consider that we receive pardon of our sins.

"IV. Do you consider that the Lord's Supper, as administered in the Church of England, or among Dissenters, or Roman Catholics, is a Christian rite, and that it is lawful to partake of it? Is it a sin to do so?

"We consider the Lord's Supper administered in the Church of England, and amongst Dissenters, and amongst Roman Catholics, null and void, and that it is wrong to administer it.

"V. Do you consider that there is any right or power in the clergy of the Church to administer sacraments, or to teach? What do you say of the Dissenting and Roman Catholic ministers?

"We consider that they have no right or power to preach or administer the sacraments. We consider them to be antichrists, false teachers, and teachers of false religion.

"VI. Do you consider the Bible, as it is received in this country by the Church of England, to be the Word of God?

"Yes.

"VII. Do you consider the Bible to include the whole of revelation, so that all articles of the Christian faith are contained in it? Is it imperfect?

"The Bible does not contain the whole of revelation. All articles of the Christian faith are not contained in the Bible. It is an imperfect revelation; it does not contain all that God has revealed.

"VIII. Have you a Bible of your own besides our Bible?

"We have the Book of Mormon, records which were taken out of a mountain, about twenty-two years ago, by a man named Smith. We consider this book of the same authority as the Bible.

"IX. Do you consider yourselves bound by every thing that is taught in the Bible, and in your own bible; or do you consider that new revelations are sometimes made which you are to follow?

"We consider ourselves bound by all that is written in the Bible, and in the Book of Mormon. We hold that new revelations are continually made, and that they cannot contradict former revelations.

"X. Do you consider every one of your body to be inspired by the Holy Ghost? Or do you think that being inspired by the Holy Ghost is necessary in order to preach the Gospel?

"We do not consider every one of our members to be inspired by

the Holy Ghost. We think that every preacher of the Gospel must be inspired by the Holy Ghost.

“XI. What do you think as to future rewards and punishments? Will they be eternal or only temporary?”

“The wicked will only suffer for a *time* in the next world; not always. Hell sufferings will not be eternal; but hell fire will be eternal.

“XII. What do you think concerning the kingdom of God on earth? Do you consider emperors, kings, and temporal rulers, to have authority according to God’s law?”

“We hold the dominion and rule of all emperors, kings, queens, and state governments to be unlawful and contrary to God’s law—contrary to Scripture. We consider Prophet Smith, or whoever represents him, to be our sovereign and king, and we consider ourselves released from all obedience to other sovereigns and rulers as a matter of conscience, though we obey the laws because we are compelled to do so.

“XIII. Had the world been existing without true religion until your prophet began to teach? How long has the true religion, according to you, existed?”

“Yes, the world remained without true religion from the time of the death of the last of the apostles or thereabouts, till the days of Smith. True religion has existed only about twenty years.

“XIV. What is your opinion of God? Is He a spirit without body, parts and passions, or has He a body like us?”

“God the Father has a body like ours.

“XV. Do Churchmen, and Dissenters, and Roman Catholics, worship the true God or a false God?”

“We all hold that Churchmen, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics worship a false God—a God that does not exist; and that we worship the true God.

“XVI. Is the worship of God as practised by all classes of Christians in the Church, Dissent, and Romanism, an idolatry?”

“We consider the worship of God as practised by Churchmen, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics to be idolatry.

“XVII. Is it blasphemy and wickedness to worship the God worshipped by the Church of England, Dissenters, and Romanists?”

“It is blasphemy and wickedness to offer up prayers or worship to the God who is worshipped by Christians generally.

“XVIII. Can the true God eat, and drink, and talk? Is he like a man in form, feature, and size?”

“God the Father can eat, drink, and talk like us. He is like a man in form, feature, and size.

“XIX. May there be several such Gods—more than one?”

“There may be several such gods, and true gods. We read there are gods—there must be more than one God—there is only one Supreme God, but there are many gods under Him.

“XX. Can God the Father be in two places at once?”



"God the Father cannot in person be in two places at one time; so that He is not omnipresent.

"XXI. Are there three *persons* in one God or three *substances*?

"There are three substances?

"XXII. Is the Son of God omnipresent? Can the Father and the Son, if not omnipresent, attend in person to the affairs of government in God's kingdom?

"He directs his kingdom by the influence of his Spirit upon the apostles and teachers.

"XXIII. Are those who worship a God who is believed to be without body, and to be omnipresent, in the way of salvation, or in the way of perdition?

"Such persons are not in the way of salvation, but in the way of perdition. All Churchmen, Dissenters, and Roman Catholics, are therefore in the way of perdition.

"XXIV. Are you yourselves inspired by God?

"We are inspired by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel. We speak with the same authority as the apostles did. We cannot make a mistake.

"XXV. Can you work miracles in proof of your commission from God?

"We cannot work miracles to prove that we are commissioned by the Holy Ghost.

"XXVI. Is the worship of the God worshipped by all Christians till your communion began, an idolatry, as absurd as the worship of a crocodile, or of a bottle of smoke?

"We consider it absurd to worship the God worshipped by Christians generally till our Church arose.

"XXVII. What officers are there in your Church?

"Apostles, elders or bishops, teachers, priests, deacons."

By means of this document<sup>1</sup>, the author of "*Friendly Warnings*" was enabled, without fear of contradiction, to state from his pulpit the nature of the Mormon creed, which, we need not add, it was easy for him to refute by plain arguments drawn from Holy Scripture. The remedy proved efficacious; error fled before the face of truth, and the false teachers ceased to molest his flock.

<sup>1</sup> Let those who doubt the propriety of the assembling of Convocation for the revival of the discipline, and the revision of the Canons of the Church, ponder the contents of this document, and reflect that, in the present state of Church law, a clergyman is liable to suspension from his office, as an "offender," if he feels it impossible, consistently with his conscience, to express over the corpse of one who lived and died in this delusion, the hope that "this his brother" is "resting in Christ," as one of "those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy name." Where, in the whole range of grievances, political and religious, is there another grievance greater than this? And yet there are men, Churchmen, clergymen, nay, bishops, who see no occasion for the revival of the legislative functions of the Church?

We should be wanting in our duty to the Church if we were to conclude the present exposure of these two fearful, and, to some extent, analogous delusions, without expressing our sorrowful conviction that they are to be regarded, not merely as aberrations of the human mind, under the wily influence of Satan, but as punishments which the Church has brought upon herself by the inadequacy of her own teaching,—would we were not compelled to add, the faintness of her faith,—upon the subject which forms the central point, both of Irvingism and Mormonism, the influence, and operation in the Church, of God the Holy Ghost. We cannot better express the sense which we entertain of the short-comings of our Church on this essential point, vitally connected with her very existence as a branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, than by transcribing the following questions publicly asked by one of her Presbyters, on the occasion of the sanction given by a large portion of the English Episcopate to the establishment of a regular order of unordained Scripture readers, that is, in Church language, of evangelists sent forth with a human commission and in human strength, to do the work for which Christ has given His commission and the power of His Holy Spirit.

“Is it dealing faithfully with the ordinance of ‘Consecration of Bishops,’ which is one of the ordinances of the Holy Ghost, and the highest of them, to confer that consecration upon men who are, by a fiction of law, elected by the Church, but in reality nominated, not by the Head of the State, whose supremacy the Church recognizes,—that too has passed into a fiction,—but by the heads of the political party which at any time may chance to wield the powers of the Crown, and which, whatever be its name, can, in the present state of the country, neither be expected to sympathize cordially with the Church, nor expect to possess her confidence? Since the advisers of the Crown are confessedly dependent on the support of an assembly in which, along with a small minority of sound Churchmen, and a large number of unsound and merely nominal Churchmen, Romanists, Protestant Dissenters of every denomination, Socinians, Deists, and, as we shall soon have to add, last not least, the Jew, are severally entitled to sit and vote, can it be right, is it decent, that the advisers *pro tempore* of the Crown should have the power of placing whomsoever they may select, in that position in which Churchmen are called upon, by their principles, to recognise them as those whom ‘the Holy Ghost hath made overseers over the flock?’

“Is it dealing faithfully with the ordinance of ‘Ordering of Priests,’ which is another ordinance of the Holy Ghost, to confer the order of the Priesthood upon men who, it is notorious, do not believe in the doctrine, and are not prepared to minister according to the discipline, of our Church; who are known to be, if not abettors, yet excusers, of the

erroneous and strange doctrines which they are called upon to promise that they will with all faithful diligence banish and drive away; men whose unsoundness might be ascertained even by simply laying the finger upon certain passages in the office for the ministration of the initiatory Sacrament of the Christian Church, and asking them the plain question: 'Dost thou honestly believe this? and wilt thou honestly teach and maintain it?'

"Is it dealing faithfully with the Ordinance of 'Ordering of Deacons,' which is another Ordinance of the Holy Ghost, to confer the order of the Diaconate only upon those who seek admission to it as to a probation and transition state to the Presbyterate; and to allow the order of Deacons, in the true sense of the word, to remain a dead letter?

"Is it dealing faithfully with the Ordinance of 'Confirmation,' which is another Ordinance of the Holy Ghost, to minister it, as it is ministered in nine cases out of ten, to those who are not even aware that they are, by this Ordinance, to seek, and, seeking, to receive, the gifts of the Holy Ghost; who consider it merely as a decent ceremony, as a renewal of their Baptismal vows, and as a passport to another Ordinance, the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, which, after all, again, in nine cases out of ten, they never approach? Is it dealing faithfully with that Ordinance to minister it after the instruction, and upon the certificate, of Ministers who do not themselves believe, and therefore cannot teach, that it is the Ordinance by which the lay members of the Church are personally brought under the operation of the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost; yea, and to discountenance, as is too often the case, those Ministers who set that Ordinance before their people in all its awe-inspiring dignity as the Ordinance of the Holy Ghost?

Can we expect, that where there is such extensive unfaithfulness in dealing with the Ordinances of the Holy Ghost, there will be a powerful exhibition of the presence of the Holy Ghost in the Church, as a Spirit of Truth, of Sanctification, of Union, and of Peace? Can we wonder that error, worldliness, division, and strife, should abound?

"And is it surprising that another, and a most awful step in this downward progress of unfaithfulness, the formal superseding of the Holy Ghost altogether, by the introduction of *an order of Ministers, set apart, but without any Ordinance of the Holy Ghost*, should find such extensive favour and such high sanction in our Church?"

We will only add, that the same faintness of faith,—not to call it unbelief,—as regards the presence and operation of the Holy Ghost in the Church of God, lies at the root of the hesitation felt by too many in our day respecting the only measure to which Churchmen can look with confidence, for the remedying of the many grievous evils under which the Church is suffering, the revival of her Synodal functions. If men were in the habit of realizing the abiding presence of God the Holy Ghost, the giver



of life to the Church as a body, as well as to all her members,—instead of looking with distrust and apprehension to the meeting of her Bishops and Clergy, they would put their trust in the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, specially invoked by and for the deliberative assemblies of the Church, in the firm faith that He will not fail, now as of old, to be her guide into all truth, and to gird her with spiritual strength in the day of battle.

---

ART. III. 1.—*The Reformers of the Anglican Church and Mr. Macaulay's History of England, second edition.* By CHANCELLOR HARRINGTON. London: Rivingtons. 1850.

Now that the first buzz which welcomed Mr. Macaulay's History into the reading world is over, we have some hope of a hearing. When the world bursts forth into a rapture of hasty admiration of "the last new work," the wise critic will wisely place his pen behind his ear, lean back in his easy chair, and learning the art of well-timed silence, patiently "bide his time."

Sometimes our variable and eccentric friend, "the public," as premature in its praise as in its censure, is determined to be pleased before the book is out: the very advertisement is read with glistening and approving eyes; the verdict is on the lip before the trial has come on; partiality outstrips the slow, dull feet of evidence, and the judgment is prospectively pronounced. The moment Mr. Macaulay's History came reeking from the press, it was evident that the thing was settled, the mind of the public was made up, the book was to be received with ready-made applause. A long avenue of new editions opened on Messrs. Longman's delighted eyes; young ladies and grave men agreed in commendation, differing only in the texture of their compliments; the "charming," "beautiful," "interesting,"—the pound of feathers of the one, balancing the "powerful," "brilliant," "able,"—the pound of lead of the other.

For ourselves,—it may be from an unamiable prospective dislike of what every body amiably and prospectively admires,—we admit that we felt considerable distrust the instant we were told that the sparkling Reviewer was about to take the sterner task of the Historian. We were not prepared to accept the tableauxism of the Edinburgh articles as a sample of historic powers.

We do not purpose to weary our readers with analyzing the book from the first page to the last; but we shall content ourselves with a few brief remarks on a small portion of it, viz., on that portion in which Mr. Macaulay speaks of the Reformers of the English Church.

And here, first of all, we protest against the Romanism of Mr. Macaulay. He starts with the old Romish assertion, that the Reformation was no Reformation at all; that the English Church was at that period born into the world, not reformed; that it was

not, that it did not exist, that there was no such thing; for he speaks of "*the Founders of the Anglican Church.*" It is important in these days to recall the views of one who is of that political party now raving against Romish aggression, now affecting a righteous indignation and surprise at the Pope in treating the English Church as if it did not exist. This historian, not in the hasty language of periodical literature, but in the cautious, well-considered words of deliberate history, speaks of the *foundation*, of the birth, of the commencement of the English Church, as taking place at that juncture which historians call the Reformation. Such an assertion, of course, goes to the very root of the Church. If we were not at that time, we are not now; if the Church began then, was then formed, it was—it is, no part of the Church of Christ. Continuance is the very law of the Church's existence. There may be expansion; there may be development; there may be growth of new limbs in new countries: but if in an old Christian country, which has been for centuries a portion of the body of Christ, a Church is *founded*, whatever is then founded is no true part of the Church; if the old body altogether ceases and dies, and simultaneously with its death a new body arises, not sent from any other land, not growing out of the old branch, nor connected with it, but self-originating—originating with any man or set of men,—then either that man or set of men must lay claim to some new revelation, some miraculous powers; or we must condemn their work as the work of man, as mere hay, straw, stubble.

Mr. Macaulay then, be it observed, takes this ground, this Romish ground, this ground of Cardinal Wiseman in his new schismatic hierarchy; anticipating their assumption, he says that the English branch of Christ's Church is not a reformed branch, but is something altogether new, a new creation, not an improved, purified continuation of an old corrupt branch of Christ's Church, but something originating at that time, or originating with certain men, with "founders,"—a new race of Apostles. We ask our readers to weigh well the words of this abettor and advocate of Romish views,—this forerunner of the Cardinal Archbishop; for it is important to show the public what political parties or men have had to do with Romish aggression.

Very different is the language of Bishop Hall, whom the Romanizing historian so plainly contradicts. "We profess this Church of ours by God's grace reformed—reformed, I say, not new made, as some envious spirits allege. For my part, I am ready to sink into the earth with shame when I hear that hackneyed reproach, 'Where was your Church before Luther? Where was your Church?' Here, ye cavillers! We desired the



reformation of an old religion, not the formation of a new. The Church was reformed, not new wrought. It was the same Church that it was before, only purged from some superfluous and pernicious additaments. Is it a new face that was lately washed? a new garment that was mended? a new house that is repaired? Blush, if ye have any shame, who fondly cast this in our teeth."

Now after starting with an assertion so opposite to that of Bishop Hall, Mr. Macaulay, with unhistorical inaccuracy, fails to give us any account or list of these "founders of the Anglican Church." We are left to grope in the dark, or to discover for ourselves who they are, or whom he means. Taking the hint of Mr. Macaulay's able assailant, Chancellor Harington, we must venture on the conjecture, that he must mean the compilers of the Book of Common Prayer. We must look upon the Prayer Book as the authoritative declaration of the Reformers' opinions, as the index of their minds, as their new statute-book, as the exponent of their notions of Scriptural and Christian truth.

Without, then, at first looking at the men, we will look at their *work*,—at the fruit of their labours,—at the result of their joint counsel. With this Prayer Book before us, we hear Mr. Macaulay, first of all, charging the founders of the Anglican Church with the denial of Episcopacy as a divine institution; with the Prayer Book before us, we turn at once to that part which treats of Episcopacy, to see whether it agrees with Mr. Macaulay's charge. We find, however, that those who are said to have denied that episcopacy is of divine institution expressly assert the contrary. "It is evident," is the language of the Ordinal, "unto all men diligently reading *the Holy Scripture* and the ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church,—bishops, priests, and deacons."

Now we say that the Ordinal is *the* proof, *the* evidence upon this point. If upon any matter men have talked, deliberated, thought, consulted, we look to the *result* of their meetings, deliberations, thoughts, consultations, as the true test of their fixed, real, deliberate opinions. Whatever may have been started, canvassed, considered in the course of deliberation, we make light of, and look to the *result*. It is the only fair way of discovering what men really hold, what is their conviction, their real judgment. In this way we should deal with the Council of Trent: we are not anxious to inquire what the several members, in the course of deliberation, suggested, asserted, thought, proposed, or weighed; we cannot fairly charge them, as a body, with the opinions expressed in the course of their work; we look to the result, to the decrees of the Council, to the "*litera scripta*," to

the authorized, formal, well-weighed issue of the various opinions of the various minds engaged : so, likewise, Mr. Harington rightly draws us to the Ordinal ; he rightly puts the preface to the Ordinal side by side with Mr. Macaulay's assertion ; he rightly says, There is the opinion, the fixed, well-weighed, well-considered judgment of "the founders of the Anglican Church ;" there they assert that episcopacy is of divine institution. Whatever points may have been raised, whatever debates, whatever questions of difficulty, whatever variety of opinions, we find at last that all their minds were moulded into one, that all at last agreed together ; and in judging of them fairly, we must judge of them by their great corporate act, to which each put his hand ; we must go to the Ordinal, and by the Ordinal their opinions on Episcopacy must be discovered. In a day of great agitation, when new views, new ideas, new doctrines were continually broached, we might expect to find occasional inconsistencies in individual "founders ;" but on them no stress can fairly be laid after they have once given forth a final judgment in so formal and so solemn a way. "This office," we must remember, "was drawn up in the year 1549, under the authority of King Edward VI., by the archbishop, six bishops, and six other eminent Reformers, Cranmer being the chief." Let us see how the Preface runs : "It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time, there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." And "the DIVINE appointment of the several orders is expressly declared in the first and subsequent Ordinals :—'Almighty God, Giver of all good things, who by Thy Holy Spirit, hast appointed divers orders in Thy Church ; mercifully behold this Thy servant, now called to the work or ministry of a bishop,' (or priest or deacon, as the case may be)" and the slight alterations adopted in the subsequent editions, including the last in 1662, "tend to develope more clearly the views of our Church in favour of episcopacy, and the doctrine of apostolical succession."

In speaking of the Prayer Book, we include both the Liturgy and the Ordinal, afterwards added, as the work of the same hands, that is of the Archbishop Cranmer, Bishops Ridley, Goodrich, Holbech, Thirlby, Skyp, and Day, and six other divines. Here, then, we see the men who framed this work ; we see "the founders of the Anglican Church." These are the men who, in Mr. Macaulay's language, "retained episcopacy ; but they did not declare it to be an institution essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the Sacraments : Cranmer, indeed, plainly avowed his conviction, that in the primitive times,

there was no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether unnecessary." We must read English backwards, after reading the Ordinal, to believe Mr. Macaulay.

But as we have now considered the result of the collective deliberations of the compilers of the Liturgy and Ordinal—men whom Mr. Macaulay must mean to describe as "the Founders of the Anglican Church," let us see whether the component parts of this body of divines were in the habit of promulgating other opinions in private, whether they were surprised into the framing of such a service by any one master mind, contrary to their ordinary and accustomed view. We designedly use the words "in the *habit* of promulgating other opinions," because it is but fair thus to speak: all men have their inconsistencies; sometimes men express themselves ill, sometimes hastily, and afterwards retract what has been ill or hastily expressed; and we must not confuse occasional with habitual expressions.

First of all, then, we come to Cranmer. Did Cranmer ordinarily hold the opinion that episcopacy was "not essential to the welfare of a Christian society," and merely "retained it as an ancient, decent, and convenient ecclesiastical polity?" Cranmer has spoken many times upon the point, and his habitual view is just contrary to that which our imaginative historian has ascribed to him. Thus in the "Institution of a Christian Man," published 1537, in "the Declaration of the Functions and *Divine Institution* of Bishop and Priests, 1536-8; in the *Erudition of a Christian Man*, 1543; in his *Catechism*, 1548; in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, 1551; and in the Preface to the Ordinal, Cranmer over and over again, in many different ways and forms of speech, plainly, clearly 'derived,' in Dr. Hickes's language, the order of bishops and priests from Christ and his Apostles, and from them successively to others, unto the world's end." We would refer our readers to Mr. Harington's pamphlet, from page 47 to 57, if they wish to see the passages in the different works alluded to, either compiled or sanctioned by Cranmer, in which he asserts that there are both bishops and priests, that they derive their mission from Christ and his Apostles, and that imposition of hands is not "superfluous." If our readers examine the dates of these various publications, they will see how wide the range is, —1536, 1537, 1538, 1543, 1548, 1549 (the Ordinal), 1551.

There is, indeed, a gap in these dates, a gap between 1538 and 1543. And here we come at once to one of Cranmer's inconsistencies. The inconsistency, however, will not much help the historian; for he has led the public to believe that it was the rule, not the exception, in Cranmer to deny the Divine institu-



tion of episcopacy. Mr. Macaulay has forgotten logic, however wide or various his other acquirements may be; he has drawn a universal conclusion from a particular premise, and this particular not persisted in but withdrawn. It is true that in the year 1540, to quote Dr. Brett, "Archbishop Cranmer's notions which he had were not agreeable to the doctrine of the primitive Church." But if, with so many, so frequent assertions of episcopacy, as a Divine institution and as necessary to the Christian Church, and unto the efficacy of the Sacraments, there was a single occasion on which these views were not maintained, we ought fairly to look upon it as an inconsistency in the man; it cannot otherwise be judged: and that writer who seizes upon that single occasion, and draws from it a general inference, and speaks of Cranmer generally as one who did not think episcopacy divinely ordained, or needful, makes an unfair, an unjust, an unwarrantable use of his historic materials: he is a partisan, not an historian. What writer, we ask, is there who has not his inconsistencies? What writer has not, in some single passage, either appeared to contradict his general opinions, or really contradicted them? Yet we judge such contradictions as of little value, even if they are suffered to remain in their works.

But while Cranmer, in certain answers given to the questions of certain commissioners appointed by Henry VIII, in 1540, did show a wavering mind, and did express lax opinions; yet we find that he actually *cancelled* those lax opinions, and reverted to his former habitual and more deliberate views. We will take Bishop Burnet as our witness. Speaking of Cranmer's answers, he says, "In Cranmer's paper some singular opinions of his about the nature of ecclesiastical offices will be found; but as they are delivered by him with all possible modesty, so they were not established as the doctrine of the Church, but laid aside as particular conceits of his own. And it seems that *afterwards he changed his opinion*, for he subscribed the book that was soon after set out, which is directly contrary to those opinions set down in this paper." Nay more, Mr. Harington "proves that Cranmer, probably before the publication of the 'Erudition' in 1543, had repudiated the Erastian views imputed to him, by *cancelling his replies* to the 'Questions concerning the Sacraments,' and *subscribing to the opinions of Dr. Leighton*, who replied to the ninth question, 'That the Apostles *made Bishops by authority given unto them of Christ*.'" "And therefore," says Dr. Brett "those who urge Dr. Cranmer's authority, as the author of 'the Rights,' and others, have done, to prove that there is no necessity of an episcopal commission for the valid administration of the Sacraments, would do well to consider that it was not that prelate's

settled judgment; and howsoever he did once give it under his hand as his opinion, yet he did not continue in that mind, but subscribed the contrary doctrine soon after."

Nay, we go farther than this, and say that the very fact of Cranmer returning to his first opinions adds immense strength to their truth, and to the strength of his own conviction; for if, after holding certain opinions for many years, a man reconsiders the matter, and modifies them, and yet cannot rest content with that modification, but withdraws and cancels it, we have tremendous testimony of the reality and intensity of his former views. That these temporary and passing laxities of Cranmer were withdrawn, is evident from that "great fact," the publication of the Ordinal, in which he had a principal hand, in the year 1549. He here puts his seal to his recantation.

What then, we ask, as regards Cranmer, one of the "founders of the Anglican Church," is the value of Mr. Macaulay's assertion, that he retained episcopacy "as an ancient, decent, and convenient ecclesiastical polity," that he did not believe it to be an institution "essential to the welfare of a Christian society, or to the efficacy of the Sacraments," but that, in the primitive times, there was "no distinction between bishops and priests, and that the laying on of hands was altogether unnecessary?" What shall we say of Mr. Macaulay's charge of Erastianism, when he says, "The king, such was the opinion of Cranmer, given in the plainest words, might, in virtue of authority derived from God, make a priest; and the priest so made needed no ordination whatever?" The Preface to the Ordinal is the best, and strongest, and most formal answers to these accusations.

We may here, perhaps, pardon Mr. Macaulay, who is not a theologian, for getting into some confusion as regards theological expressions concerning bishops and priests, though we cannot pardon his rashness in writing without knowledge. It is among the views of a great body of early writers, that there are but two orders, the priesthood and the diaconate; and reckoning the priesthood as a genus, they divide it into two species, the episcopate and presbytery; and yet these divines do not make any confusion between bishops and presbyters, though they assert only a twofold instead of a threefold order; they assert that it is "necessary to the welfare of a Christian society" and "to the efficacy of the Sacraments," that there should be bishops, priests, and deacons. Indeed, these opinions, in real matter and substance, are similar to those expressed in the Ordinal, though the word "order" is used in a different sense.

It is true, also, that Mr. Macaulay, acted upon, as we may suppose, by Mr. Harington's pamphlet, has altered several ex-

pressions in the fourth and subsequent editions of his History: instead, for instance, of the passage referred to running thus, "Cranmer plainly avowed his conviction that there was no distinction between bishops and priests," it is said, "Cranmer, indeed, *on one important occasion, &c.*" This alteration is a gain, so far, though it is but a part of the truth, as it is not stated that these views were altered, and opposite views afterwards embodied in the Ordinal. Part of the sting remains, viz., that once these views were held: the full truth would require the plain assertion that Cranmer afterwards thought them wrong.

But while we have this proof that Mr. Macaulay requires some such assailants as Mr. Harington to make him cautious in his assertions, what shall we say, not of a reviewer writing, like ourselves, often in hot haste, but an historian, who has so soon to modify his statements? who dashed off something about Cranmer, and has to come down from making a general assertion to the fact that so far from being a general view, it was maintained on one solitary occasion, and afterwards cancelled in the most formal way?

But to give the whole question fair consideration, we must state that previous to the publication of the Ordinal, Henry VIII. died; and it is true, that Cranmer and his suffragans took out fresh commissions, 1546, "empowering them," as Mr. Macaulay says, "to ordain and to perform other spiritual functions, till the new Sovereign should think fit to order otherwise." Mr. Macaulay supposes Cranmer by this act to look upon "his own spiritual functions, like the secular functions of the chancellor and treasurer," which "were at once determined by a demise of the Crown." Now, first of all, we are not prepared at once to allow that the commission is so to be interpreted. We cannot at once give way to Mr. Macaulay's reading of the passage. If the fact is of any value to our historian, it of course proves, according to his view, that "all the power of the keys" was handed over to this royal pope by the archbishop. But as many previous writers have taken an opposite view of the commission, and consider that Cranmer did not design to place the king in St. Peter's chair, even though he may have conceded too much on some occasions to royal power, we may venture to follow these our forerunners, who anticipated Mr. Macaulay, and have thus prevented us from being singular in our interpretation of the fact.

Now, there are two passages in this commission on which stress is laid, and the real question is whether the one at all qualifies the other. First, the archbishop is authorised to ordain and to perform all other spiritual functions, "vice, nomine, et



auctoritate nostris." This seems, at first sight, to make the king the fountain of episcopacy; but there is a clause in the same commission which runs thus: "præter et ultra ea quæ tibi ex sacris literis divinitus commissæ esse dignoscuntur." This seems, in our judgment, to qualify the former assertion. So it was held by the writers we have alluded to. Thus, Mr. Harington, in his Appendix, quotes largely from Leslie's "Case of the Regale and Pontificate, stated," in which he gives—

"A short and clear state of the case lately discoursed (at a conference) concerning the regale, or power of the State over the Church, as to her purely spiritual character, First, It was agreed on all hands that the State cannot deprive bishops of their episcopal character, (Mr. Macaulay asserting that it is in the king's power 'to confer the episcopal character, or to take it away',) but that they remain bishops still.' One of the conference here asked how this was consonant with 'the commission that Archbishop Cranmer took out for his bishopric from Edward VI.' &c., and the like done by other bishops, whereby they held their bishoprics during the pleasure of the king, and owned to derive all their power, even ecclesiastical, from the crown, 'velut a supremo capite et omnium infra regnum nostrum magistratuum fonte et scaturigine,' &c.—it was said, 1st. That all this is to be understood only of the civil power and authority, which by the laws of the land were annexed to the sacred office; as the civil jurisdiction that is granted to the bishop's courts, to the bishops themselves, as lords of Parliament, &c.; to the civil penalties which follow their excommunications, and *the legal protection to their ordinations, and other acts of their office*; and these are derived only and solely from the king. Nothing of this was granted to the Apostles, or the bishops, their successors, by Christ; and as the State granted these, they may recall them, if there be sufficient reason for it. That in the very commission before-mentioned, which was given to Cranmer for his bishopric, there is an exception: 'Præter et ultra ea quæ tibi ex sacris literis divinitus commissæ esse dignoscuntur.' These the king did not take upon him to grant, but only what was over and above these, that is, the protection and civil privileges granted by the State, which were annexed to fortify and encourage these. And take notice, that of that of which the king is here called the *head and fountain*, is *omnium magistratuum*, of the magistracy within his dominions, as well ecclesiastical as temporal; for, there is a civil magistracy annexed by the laws to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and *of this only ought these expressions to be meant*; because we see the other, the spiritual authority, which, in Holy Scripture, is granted to the Church, is expressly excepted; and that ecclesiastical authority which, in this commission, is said to flow from the king, is 'juris dicendi autoritas, et quæcumque ad forum ecclesiasticum pertinent'; that is, the episcopal jurisdiction considered as a forum—a court established by the secular power, and part of the laws of the land. That in the said History of the Reformation, part i. in the

Addenda, No. 5, p. 321, there is a declaration made of the function and *Divine Institution* of bishops and priests, subscribed by Lord Cromwell, then vicegerent to King Henry VIII. in ecclesiastical matters, by Archbishop Cranmer, with the archbishop of York, eleven other bishops, and twenty divines and canonists, declaring that *the power of the keys and other Church functions is formally distinct from the civil power, &c.* And *ibid*, Collect, Records, No. 10, p. 177, there is a judgment of eight bishops concerning the king's supremacy, whereof *Cranmer* is the first, asserting that the commission which Christ gave to his Church, had 'no respect to kings' and princes' power;' but that the Church had it by 'the word of God, to which Christian princes acknowledge themselves subject.' They then deny that the commission Christ gave to his Church did extend to civil power over kings and princes; and they own that the civil power was over bishops and priests, as well as other subjects; that is, in civil matters, which the Church of Rome did deny; but they assert that 'bishops and priests have the charge of souls, are the messengers of Christ, to teach the truth of the Gospel, and loose and bind sin, &c., as Christ was the Messenger of his Father;' which sure was independent of all kings and power upon earth. Here one desired it might not be forgot that Bonner took out the same commission for his bishopric from Henry VIII., as that before mentioned of Cranmer from Edward VI."

Such is the view taken of the commission by no mean judges of such matters. But, after all, while this commission might, in Mr. Macaulay's view, be supposed to express a strong Erastianism, it leaves the question of the Divine institution of episcopacy untouched; the whole matter that is raised is, not whether bishops derive their mission from Christ, but whether they derive it through the medium of kingly authority, or not. For ourselves, we cannot but regard the term, "vice regis," coupled as it is, in the same document, with "divinitus commissa," &c. to be a loose expression, by which the King authorized the legal *exercise* of episcopal power, and did not mean to give as from himself that episcopal power. We cannot believe that Cranmer meant to admit that he ceased to be a bishop, as the chancellor or the treasurer ceased to be chancellor or treasurer, by the death of the king,—that bishops by kings' deaths were un-bishoped, and needed to be re-bishoped by the new kings. There must be an abundant mass of evidence proving the frequent and formal repetition of such a view, before we have any right, as candid searchers of truth, to admit it. We challenge proof of any such accumulated evidence as would make the words "vice regis" go the whole length to which Mr. Macaulay would stretch it. All the evidence that we can obtain tells the other way. Take, for instance, the Ordinal framed in 1549: where is there a trace of any such view?

where any assertion, however faint or indefinite, that the king was "vicar of God;" that the bishop or priest confirmed, or administered Sacraments, "vice regis," as a mere deputy or proxy; that the king, if he willed, could confirm, or administer Sacraments; or that such confirmation, or administration of Sacraments, were valid? The notion is preposterous.

We must refer our readers to the various works and documents to which we have already alluded, issued or sanctioned by Cranmer in 1536, 1537, 1538, 1543, 1548, 1551.

While we thus vindicate Cranmer's memory, we are not saying that he did not practically leave too much to the will of the king; and yet, though through the necessity of the times, through lack of moral courage, through intimacy with foreign Reformers, he may have sometimes expressed himself inconsistently, and have given way too largely to kingly power, yet we see plainly, amid all his inconsistencies and concessions, what his own mind really was: he did believe that "it is evident to those diligently reading the *Holy Scriptures* and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these *orders of ministers in Christ's Church*—*bishops, priests, and deacons*, which offices were evermore had in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by public prayer, *with imposition of hands*, were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority." Passing from the Preface, we see his judgment of this "lawful authority;" we see that bishops consecrated bishops, according to the service which he helped to frame, without one word of reference to a higher earthly fountain, without one word of "vice regis;" that bishops with the presbytery ordained presbyters, without any reference to spiritual power or commission derived from God through kings. We find these awful words, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," the whole power of binding and loosing, without any reference to the kingly authority, whether as affecting the bishop who ordains, or the presbyter who receives ordination. In short, the whole service is at this moment used by the American Church, without alteration, where there is no prince or king, so little is the royal popery of Macaulay's imagination embodied in it.

But passing from Cranmer to "less courtly divines," to the other compilers of the Liturgy and the Ordinal, the other "founders of the Anglican Church," we will consider whether they privately and individually held fainter notions concerning the Divine institution of episcopacy, &c., than those they corporately and jointly expressed in the Ordinal. Besides Cranmer there were six bishops and six other divines. The bishops, as we have already



said, were Ridley, Goodrich, Holbech, Thirlby, Skyp, and Day. Now, there was put forth a certain "declaration made of the functions and *Divine institution* of bishops and priests," signed by thirty-eight bishops, divines, and canonists; of those, seven were compilers of the Book of Common Prayer, viz. Cranmer, Skyp, Robertson, Redmayne, May, Cox, and Goodrich. Then we have the "*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*," which speaks distinctly of the threefold ministry, as being the true Scriptural and primitive form; and in this work Cranmer, Goodrich, Ridley, Cox, Taylor, and May, six compilers of the Prayer Book, took part. Bishop Thirlby writes thus, "Making of bishops hath two parts, appointment and ordering. Appointment, which the Apostles by necessity made by common election, and sometimes by their own several assignment, could not be done by Christian princes, because at that time they were not; and now at these days appertaineth to Christian princes and rulers. *But in the ordering wherein grace is conferred, (as afore,) the Apostles did follow the rule taught them by the Holy Ghost, per manuum impositionem, cum oratione et jejunio.*" Bishop Day declares that "bishops have authority by Scripture to ordain bishops and priests."

We think we have said enough, without wearying our readers with further evidence, to prove that Mr. Macaulay has spoken rashly; and that all the deliberate, unbiassed acts or expressions of "the founders of the Anglican Church" assert or imply the Divine institution of episcopacy. In times so unsettled, so full of new thoughts, it is not strange that hasty opinions fell even from divines; and it might be easy to prove a variety of contradictory opinions, if chance phrases or occasional assertions were picked up here and there, and cleverly patched together; but we should not judge such times in such a way; we should endeavour to trace the under-current of the more sober and settled mind of the Anglican divines; and if this be done we have no fear as to the general result of such inquiries. That they had faults and inconsistencies is but to say in other words that they were men; that some of them were sometimes drawn, in their haste to escape papal rule, to hurry too eagerly for protection under royal wings, is but to describe a great temptation to which they were subject; and yet the most time-serving of their acts of concession to royal rule in spiritual things, is surrounded by other acts in which they only give that due measure of authority which may be given to Christian kings.

We may wish, indeed, at this present time, that there had been throughout, and on every occasion, a plainer, more consistent definition of the extent and limit of the kingly power.

If such a definition had been wisely made at every turn of affairs, it would have saved us from many of those difficulties which press so closely upon us at this present time, and from those dangers which threaten to sweep us on to an ultra assertion of royal supremacy, in our present recoil from the aggressions of the Pope. At all times it is and will be hard rightly to settle with precision the boundaries of regal power, to give neither too much nor too little, as there are many questions of a mixed character; and, with a continual series of re-actions, we rarely reach the true "via media" upon the matter. However, more difficult still, is it for the Romanist to define the supremacy of the Pope, and the Church of Rome is wise in surrounding it by a mist of vague and hazy expressions. But, we ask, is it reasonable to expect most accurate and most precise definitions of regal authority in all writings, works, documents, at a period when the Church was struggling into independence, being utterly unused to independence? If, *on the whole*, in such an age, we find general assertions of the limited monarchy which the crown has in spiritual matters, and of the powers which the true ministry derive from Christ independently of kings, however kings may be appealed to to allow the open exercise of their power, we have all that we can fairly expect on such a subject. Great indeed is the debt we owe to the Reformers; and if there be some flaws in such men, we should not found arguments upon those flaws; neither because they may occasionally have yielded too much to kingly authority, should we exclaim, "*All is the king's.*"

However, to return to the chief point we have considered, that is, the *Divine Institution of Episcopacy as maintained by the Reformers*, we think enough has been said to weaken the assertions of Mr. Macaulay. It only remains to offer Mr. Harington our hearty thanks for his able and successful publication on this matter.

- ART. IV.—1. *Poems.* By ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING.  
*New edition.* In 2 vols. London: Chapman and Hall. 1850.
2. *The Prophecy of Balaam, The Queen's Choice, and other Poems.*  
 By HELEN LOWE. London: Murray.
3. *Zareefa, a Tale; and other Poems.* By the Author of "*Cephalus and Procris*," &c. London: Pickering.

FEMALE Poetry! this scarcely seems to us, ungallant as we are, a delightful theme, or a glorious memory; for is it not, generally speaking, mawkish, lackadaisical, and tedious? To us, at least, it is. Look at the "*Literary Souvenir*," or "*Book of Beauty*," if you want to see the kind of thing we mean: what people denominate poetry of the affections. Soft, mellifluous strains, in which some one generally religious thought is kept for the last verse; this kind of climax being repeated a thousand times, with a more than wearisome uniformity. Think of the endless twaddle perpetrated by L. E. L., with here and there something like a fresh flower peeping forth from amongst her sere and withered blossoms. That unhappy woman inflicted an almost irreparable injury on English literature, on English poetry at least; one from which the latter has taken many years to recover. She succeeded, supported, encouraged, and puffed as she was by silly and ignorant critics, in persuading the general public to identify poetry and mawkishness as one and the same thing; to regard the strains of the lyre as naturally and necessarily morbid, and frightfully sentimental; and, consequently, only adapted to the taste of very young gentlemen and ladies, and exceedingly mischievous for *them*. We know her unhappy fate, and have mourned over it, and have thereby been induced to keep silence for a time; but the truth must be told at last. She was one of the most utter nuisances the literature of the nineteenth century has been afflicted with! Here and there she really struck out a poetic thought, though it was almost always marred in the delivery; and some few of her shorter strains, for instance, the illustrations of modern pictures (we may mention "*the Combat*," by Etty), have some real power and sweetness: but, O! the ocean of morbid common-place in which swim these waifs:—the wretched, intolerably wretched, versification, the bad rhymes, the careless grammar, the unpardonable profanation of the good and the beautiful! Consider this one fact.—This woman undertook



for years to fill a large annual with nothing but her poetry, in illustration of certain prints to be furnished her, whatever they might be! Now this fact alone expresses far more than any condemnation of ours could do. What a vista of dreary, morbid, boundless common-place does this disclose to us! And contemporary criticism could applaud, could think this *annual* undertaking perfectly natural, and rather sublime.

We repeat, that poetry has suffered amongst us from nothing more than from this unhallowed desecration. It became for a long time a valueless drug in the market. The very fact that L. E. L. did possess natural powers only rendered their exertion the more fatal to our poetic literature. The existence of and the praise lavished on this wordy trash formed one great barrier to the rising fame of Tennyson; and has impressed the majority of those now living with a conviction, not to be shaken, that English poets of the present day are second-rate, and little worthy of attention.

Mrs. Hemans was less sickening; and yet, looking over her vague, dreamy, wordy compositions, we almost feel inclined to recal that more favourable verdict. Here is a tiresome, mellifluous sweetness, an almost total absence of thought, a superabundance of morbid feeling always welling forth. But we admit that there is gentleness, and sometimes fancy, and even poetry also, to set off against all these defects.

There are moods in which certain of Mrs. Hemans's strains are dear to us, as they are perhaps to many of our readers: only not too many at a time! Then there was another of this class, a Miss Jewsbury. To be sure she has passed away, and it may seem unkind to revive her memory: yet in all "*Affection's Gifts*," and "*Friendship's Keepsakes*," you will be sure to find one or two of her vague wandering—melodies we cannot call them, unless slow, dull, autumn breezes, whining through a keyhole, deserve that appellation. Always the same leafless gloom, amidst which, here and there, a little pale, frightened flower, colourless and marred, may perk its head up, and yield you a sickly smile, and smile itself to death again!

We do not wish to upbraid more of these doleful lady-singers, and truly their number is countless. "*Breezes sigh*," they may answer us, "*why should not we? rain-drops weep, why are tears denied us? night mourns, why should we be gay? True, there is heaven above: when we go thither, we will sing more gladly with the angels!*" Now, this is a very pretty lady-poetess's speech: only, unfortunately, she would have condemned us to listen to as many stanzas of eight lines each, as there are thoughts or rather fancies in our answer: any one of the class in

question could do it, and their compositions would be as like as two T's; a little better or a little worse to be sure, as far as rhyme and language are concerned, but all "so very sweet," "so charming really." Well, is this a true count, or is it not? Do we exaggerate? Now, all poetesses are *not* of this order and calibre, witness the two names at the head of this article. Besides, there is Mrs. Southey, of whom we take shame to ourselves for knowing so little; but what we do know has seemed to us of sterling quality; and, again, there is Mary Howitt, some of whose sweet, fresh, cheerful strains are really pure, as the dewdrops of the morn, not like the tears of an autumn mist: and, no doubt, there are others who ought to be mentioned (we beg any lady poetess who reads this, and has published, to take for granted she is included amongst the number), and still one general verdict must stand against the lady-singers. We know not whether there is essentially or necessarily an absence of concentration in female thought: judging from many novels we have seen, and many letters also, we should say, No! The memory of Miss Edgeworth only forbids the thought. Women are not necessarily or usually thus morbid in their ordinary talk: were they so, they would by no means be the queens of creation we consider them. It is only *female poetry* which is thus deficient in healthfulness, cheerfulness, and sound sense. With regard to the latter quality, it is our mature opinion that women are usually more sensible than men; but you certainly would not guess it from their poetry, where they seem to think it *necessary* to be weak and foolish. Of course this dictum is to be taken with a due degree of allowance for its sweepingness.

Foreign poetesses are not a whit better than English; think of Madame Desbordes-Valmont (we think that is the way she spells her name), think of her pitiful wails and lamentations, "Mes Pleurs" and "Mes Larmes" innumerable, enough to fill an ocean. As for Germany's songstresses, though she has several, they are all unknown to fame, save "Betty Paoli," whom we admire greatly, and should rank upon a level with Mrs. Browning and Miss Lowe, for artistic power; that is, we recognise her's as a kindred spirit with those of Germany's greatest bards, one who may justly claim equality with them; but then we have always called her "the female Byron," so sad is she, so bitter, so painfully passionate; nevertheless, she is great. We recommend Betty Paoli's poems to the study of every lover of German poetry; they are pure and noble artistic creations, earnest-hearted and earnest-minded, and above all, *not diffuse* (wonderful to relate); her words rarely or never outrun the thoughts they represent.

Still, in every country, female poetry is doleful or morbid, and generally speaking it is weak and diffuse, and therefore, as we said at starting, it does not present a too delightful theme.

But it is far otherwise with the strains of Elizabeth Barrett Browning and Helen Lowe, who, though widely different, are both true poets; not *poetesses only*; each taking a high rank amongst her bardic peers, and one which, if we mistake not, she is destined long to keep. We cannot aver that either is wholly free from that shade or tinge of morbid sorrow from which no female poetess has ever yet escaped; but in neither of them is this the predominant feature: it rather forms the background in both instances (if we may consider their poetry as two great master-pieces by some illustrious artist), from which the main subject stands out in bold and bright relief, commanding our hearty admiration. As a lyric *poet*, Mrs. Browning takes high rank among the bards of England: there are few to surpass her; perhaps none in her especial beauties,—in the combination of romantic wildness with deep, true tenderness and most singular power. And so, again, Miss Lowe need not fear comparison with great dramatists: in her works there is little or no display of passion; all is calm, concentrated power, fixed energy of thought, a certain reserve of greatness. This latter lady has not yet been acknowledged, we believe, as she should and must be, though the “Quarterly” hymned her praises after its own fashion some years ago: and this is not wonderful, for her powers do not dazzle; there is little to startle or amaze, and, though there is much to thrill the thoughtful, there are few appeals to tears. “The Prophecy of Balaam” is, in our estimation—and we speak advisedly—one of the grandest dramatic poems in existence. Once read by one who is capable of reflection, it can never be forgotten: it is based on eternal truth, and its power is only deeper and more real from the total absence of effort. All is grand, stately, and yet beautiful, like some fixed marble statue: only *here* there is life in the veins; a heart throbs beneath the marble,—“it could arise and walk!” What wonder that contemporary criticism should neglect such a work? The old adage applies as ever:—the boys pick up the shining pebbles by the sea-shore, but they cast the pearls away. Then, for “The Queen’s Choice,” what sweet, calm, happy grace and plaintive mournfulness breathe from this drama! If we compare it with the successful plays of the day (and we are willing to acknowledge the occasional power and pathos of “Marston”, despite his abominable taste, and the stage-cleverness of Lovel), we feel that we are passing at once from the world of false to that of true art,—from fiction to reality. Even on the stage, adequately represented, “The Queen’s Choice”



would excite a profound sensation ; but our voice cannot reach managers ; and if it could, wrapt in their comfortable mantle of stolidity, they would turn a deaf ear to our assertions.

But to our more general theme :—Mrs. Browning is not exclusively lyric, nor Miss Lowe dramatic ; for the former's " Drama of Exile " is an exquisite work of its kind, and some of Miss Lowe's poems, though we do not like them as well as her plays, have much real merit, merit of a quiet and somewhat sombre character, like the beauties of an autumn twilight, sinking down on a fair landscape, fringed with dark and leafy woods. We cannot hope to do justice to both of these ladies, or perhaps to either of them, on the present occasion : perhaps we have acted wrongly in stringing their names together.

Mrs. Browning may well feel that she had a right to an article for herself alone, as much as her great poet-husband, to whom we strove to do tardy justice but lately. He and she are kindred spirits ; and yet there is vast difference between them. His genius is essentially, we might almost say exclusively, dramatic. The simplest line that falls from him, no matter in what shape, is a strong dramatic utterance. He has an instinctive knowledge of the hearts of men, a power of identifying himself with the passions of others, and of realising them in their most fiery outbursts, making them his own. Thus far he is impulsive, *most* impulsive, *dramatically* so ; but there his impulse, comparatively, ends : free lyric power is *not* his characteristic. A contemporary has said this but lately, and it is true : yet, it is not from lack of impulsive power that Browning fails here ; nay, he does not fail, for he never makes the attempt : he is too *exclusively* dramatic, as we have said. His earnestness of passion forbids all lyrical redundancies. It is utterly false that—as the same critic asserts, as it is not unfashionable to say,—he is devoid of *beauty*. He has the highest beauty, the highest grace : witness " Paracelsus," " Pippa Passes," " Colombe's Birthday." But he never seeks beauty for beauty's sake : his aim is the reality of passion, good or bad : if beauty is consistent with the truth, then it will be certain to be there : but the passion may so arrest your sight as to blind your eyes to the beauty ! your heart is too strongly appealed to, to allow of your stopping to admire !—A mere love of words for their own sake, this he does not seem to possess. Now a true lyric poet must ! He sings because he loves singing : true, he must have something to sing about, but this need not be much : the nightingale sings, no doubt, of the beauty of the early spring, but not over distinctly. Now Mrs. Browning is oftentimes possessed with the fine lyrical " *afflatus*," the *passion of song*, and pours herself forth in verse. This is what Browning seldom or never does, in the

same sense or way ; yet he is not a *made* poet, but a *born* one : it is his instinct to be dramatic, “*voilà tout !*” Both he and Mrs. Browning feel intensely : he thinks perhaps most deeply, yet she is a thinker too : both have a wild imagination and a potent fancy : he has a genuine vein of humour ; she has a pleasant, genial, meditative lofty strain, such as inspired her “*Wine of Cyprus.*” Upon the whole, we think Browning’s the higher and the master spirit ; her’s the more tender, and the more musical also.

But to the volumes before us, which we must deal with, we fear, very summarily. “*The Drama of Exile*” is a fervid and yet a sacred strain. At the gate of Paradise, where Milton left our first parents, the spirit of the poetess has met them, has listened to their wails of fond regret, and recorded their first wandering out into the sterile earth, thenceforth to yield man bread by the sweat of his brow. It is a grand and a solemn composition ; somewhat too diffuse perhaps, and shadowy, and mixing up ideal conceptions, abstract ideas personified, such as the Spirits of the Earth and of the Creatures, with real actual sentient beings, in a manner we can scarcely approve. This, unintentionally, gives an unreal effect to much that would be otherwise very beautiful, and even holy. And even if we admit of these twain impersonations of the powers of nature, what shall we say to those shadows of shadows, the signs of the Zodiac—vast spectral forms representing these signs being made to form a circle round the exile wanderers ? We do not see the meaning of this ; and we are sure that its effect is unhappy. Again, we must blame the almost ludicrous and hopeless pertinacity with which the chief of fallen angels is represented as troubling those with his presence who incessantly request him “*to go.*” There is something even comic in this, and we beg Mrs. Browning to believe that we do not make the remark irreverently ; the opening discourse between Gabriel and Lucifer is almost entirely, on the former’s part, a series of first commands, and then entreaties, to the latter to retire : it is obvious that Gabriel should not be made to speak so forcibly at first, if he has no power to enforce his commands ; and his entering into long reasonings afterwards, on the same theme, is a token of weakness we should not have expected from an angel. We almost fear we are waxing irreverent, which it is certainly far from our intention to be, firmly as we believe in angelic agency, and strongly as we desire to do honour to those blessed spirits which stand in the presence of our God around the throne. This first scene, very fine in parts, is followed by an exquisite chorus of Eden spirits, while Adam and Eve fly across the track traced for them by the glare of the sword of fire, self-

moved, for many miles along the waste. There are seven lines in this chorus which seem to us particularly beautiful, and which recur oftentimes in their mournful sweetness, with slight changes, adapting them to the various singers, from the Spirits of the trees, rivers, flowers, &c. Take the second of these:—

“Fare ye well, farewell!  
The river-sounds, no longer audible,  
Expire at Eden’s door!  
Each footstep of your treading  
Treads out some murmur which ye heard before:  
Farewell! the streams of Eden  
Ye shall hear nevermore.”

Is not that melancholy music, recalling the sweet songs of our own early childhood? Mark the lingering sweetness of the last two lines, where the cadence falls and rests. There is a plaintive tenderness in this, rarely surpassed. The song of the Bird-spirit should be quoted, but we have no space for it. Then follows a beautiful colloquy between Adam and Eve, held on the verge of the sword-glare: both characters are nobly conceived. We find no trace of selfishness in what falls from either of them; only the love of God seems no longer to tenant their hearts; intense love of each other has taken its place. We have not space to go through the drama *seriatim*; it is grand throughout. To our mind it is very questionable whether Lucifer should be represented as fraught with love for any thing, even for his own morning-star. Scripture represents hate and scorn as his essence, and in these consist his enmity to God. However, the song of the Morning-Star to Lucifer is exceedingly wild and glowing; we regret that we have not space to enrich our pages with it; all the lyrics introduced in this poem are noble; but most intense, perhaps, is the power displayed in that song of the Earth-spirits, when they curse our first parents for having brought the curse on them (p. 59). Its wildness is great, but is exceeded by its power:—

“And we scorn you! There’s no pardon  
Which can lean to you aright.  
When your bodies take the guerdon  
Of the death-curse in our sight,  
*Then the bee that hummeth lowest shall transcend you:*  
*Then ye shall not move an eyelid,*  
*Though the stars look down your eyes;*  
*And the earth, which ye defiled,*  
*She shall show you to the skies,—*  
‘Lo! these kings of ours—who sought to comprehend you!’



“ *First Spirit.*

“ And the elements shall boldly  
 All your dust to dust constrain ;  
 Unresistedly and coldly,  
 I will smite you with my rain !  
 From the slowest of my frosts is no receding.

“ *Second Spirit.*

“ And my little worm, appointed  
 To assume a royal part,  
 He shall reign, crowned and anointed,  
 O'er the noble human heart !  
*Give him counsel against losing of that Eden !”*

What a magnificent rhythm for scorn and irony ! The final apparition of our Lord is calmly and grandly treated. Altogether, the “ *Drama of Exile* ” is a great, though somewhat sad, creation : it is like the eyrie of the eagle, built high and near the stars, but rather cold and lonely. We cannot speak as favourably of “ *The Seraphim*,” also dramatic in its form, and, upon the whole, only an ambitious failure : it should have been excluded from the volumes before us. Its “ *Part the First*,” is peculiarly meaningless ; in which all the myriads of the angel-host having departed to gaze on *the Crucifixion*, two only, the interlocutors, Ador and Zerah, remain at the gate of heaven, also intending to follow their brethren, but stopping in the first instance for the bare purpose of talk-talk-talk, as dreary as it is meaningless. We are sorry to speak thus harshly, but the theme of the *Crucifixion* is too awful and too blessed not to have forbidden such a desecration as this, however unintentional. The whole poem labours under a painful sense of unreality, and that in treating of the greatest of all realities. There is an irreverence to our feelings in the stage-directions, so to speak, respecting the shut heavenly gate, which shocked us even at starting. The everlasting gates, which rolled aside when He, our Lord, ascended to His glory, were not “ a gate :” rather were they intervening spheres, or worlds of darkness and of majesty. Does not Mrs. Browning feel that the glories of heaven are too great for her earthly grasp ? that it far rather becomes her on such a subject to tremble and adore ? Let her pardon our frankness ; but we confess this poem (if so we must call it, where we see few poetic sparks from first to last) shocks us, and forms, in our judgment, a most unworthy sequel to her “ *Drama of Exile* !” As critics, and as Christians, *we entreat* that “ *The Seraphim* ” may be removed from the next edition !

The translation of “ *Prometheus*,” which follows, has great merit ; but we do not wholly like it. It displays Mrs. Browning’s

usual power, especially towards the close, as in the mad song of "Io;" but Prometheus's complaints are rather too rhetorically rendered, without sufficient dramatic earnestness. Pass we to the lyrics. First come two long strains, both noble, yet not amongst our favourites. "A Vision of Poets" reminds us of Tennyson's "Two Voices;" but it is far less thoughtful and more indistinct. It is emphatically a vision, and possesses only visionary beauties; and yet it is neither devoid of sublimity nor tenderness of heart. We object to what *seems* suggested by some expressions,—that every great poet must be unhappy; that he must be earnest, we believe. The portraits of the poets, drawn with a few bold lines, are sometimes very striking. Take, for instance,—

"Here, Homer, with the broad suspense  
Of thunderous brows, and lips intense,  
*With garrulous god-innocence.*"

Or again,

"Hesiod old,  
Who, somewhat blind and deaf and cold,  
*Cared most for gods and bulls.*"

Or,

"And Ossian, dimly seen or guessed:  
*Once counted greater than the rest,  
When mountain-winds blew out his vest.*"

Or, once more,

"And Goethe—with that reaching eye,  
His soul reached out from, far and high,  
*And fell from inner entity.*"

How true of that sublimest of egotists, who became so objective at last as to be no longer a human being; who from very selfishness lost self! There is beauty and majesty in this long poem, but we cannot moralise on its bearings. Pass we to the companion "Poet's Vow," which we like not much. It is poetically executed indeed, but sadly unreal. The hero gives up earthly happiness and a loving bride from mere unnatural misanthropy. He will not be happy, since so many of his fellow-men are not; and so shuts himself up, and lives and dies, useless to himself and others, a blot upon the face of nature. Such a song as this is like a picture of the desert: the leagues on leagues of weary sand may lie in the broiling sun before us, as white, as sterile, and as hideous as on the desert's self, but where was the good of painting them? If there ever *were* such a misanthrope, surely it would have been better to leave him "to perish in his self-contempt." Now follows one of the wildest romances in the English, or in any tongue, but it is also most beautiful.

The title is the "Romaunt of Margret." It is a weird tale of woe and spectral horror; but how wonderfully told! and the clinging faith of the heroine through her terrific trial endears the poem to our hearts. We shall not quote it, or quote from it, but refer our readers to the volume. This, however, we may say: it is like some wild forest-scene at midnight, with just one break in the dark round of trees, where the silvery moon shines through, sadly, palely, and sweetly, while a woodland-brooklet murmurs by. Had Mrs. Browning written this alone, she had earned our most earnest admiration. "Isabel's Child" is less perfect in its execution, we think; but very beautiful in conception. A mother, by her earnest prayers, (such prayers have power!) has prevailed on God to spare her infant, assailed by deadly fever; but as she is keeping watch over the reviving babe a strange apparition chances: it looks upon her with thoughtful eyes, through which gleams a spirit in maturity, and it finds a voice and speaks, imploring no longer to be stayed from the blessed joys of heaven. At morn the nurse finds the child dead on the mother's knee, and that mother blesses God for having taken away her darling.—Then come the Sonnets, which, generally speaking, are very fine. Let us be pardoned for suggesting that the first, "The Soul's Expression," is a little, a very little, too self-asserting! But we pass that by. There is great power in these sonnets; a concentration of thought and expression, of which ordinary lady-poetesses could form no conception in their dreams. Perhaps we should cite one.—

"I tell you, hopeless grief is passionless.  
That only men, incredulous of despair,  
Half-taught in anguish, through the midnight air,  
Beat upward to God's throne in loud access  
Of shrieking and reproach. Full desertness  
In souls, as countries, lieth silent-bare  
Under the blenching vertical eye-glare  
Of the absolute heav'ns. Deep-hearted man, express  
Grief for thy dead in silence like to death;  
Most like a monumental statue set  
In everlasting watch and moveless woe,  
Till itself crumble to the dust beneath.  
Touch it: the marble eyelids are not wet:  
If it could weep, it could arise and go."

We thought of naming the more singularly beautiful sonnets, but there are so many beautiful that we must refrain. We pass to the second volume. Here come all our prime favourites, which we are unable to dwell on now as we should wish. Here is "the Romaunt of the Page," sad and sweet: may not blue-



bells ring out such music to fairy ears when the summer-winds pass over them? Yet, no; there is too much of gloom and sorrow here: rather may the elfs of the woods list such wild strains, sung to them by autumn breezes rustling the green leaves of the old oak-tree. Then comes the magnificent "Onora, or Lay of the Brown Rosary," as it is entitled. We should like to tell the story of this last; but we may not. A good and gentle girl, who abandons heaven to keep her life! Her lover is returning from the wars, yet she must die, unless she make her unhallowed compact: and she makes it; and her little brother suspects the terrible truth; and at the altar her lover—but no, we will tell no more. Only let us say, never was wilder, sweeter ballad sung or said! And for the second part, where Onora is sleeping, and the angels dare not draw too nigh her, since she has forsaken God, and the evil spirit bids her yield her good dream, in which she wanders with her dead father through the summer fields—What say you to this, reader our's?—

*"Evil Spirit in a Nun's garb by the bed.*

"Forbear that dream! forbear that dream! too near to heaven it leaned.

*"Onora in sleep.*

"Nay, leave me this—but only this! 'tis but a dream, sweet fiend!

*"Evil Spirit.*

"It is a *thought*.

*"Onora in sleep.*

"A sleeping thought—most innocent of good—  
It doth the Devil no harm, sweet fiend! it cannot, if it would.  
I say in it no holy hymn,—I do no holy work,  
I scarcely hear the Sabbath-bell that chimeth from the kirk.

*"Evil Spirit.*

"Forbear that dream—forbear that dream!

*"Onora in sleep.*

"Nay, let me *dream* at least!  
That far-off bell, it may be took for viol at a feast—  
I only walk among the fields, beneath the autumn-sun,  
With my dead father, hand in hand, as I have often done.

\* \* \* \* \*

*"Evil Spirit.*

"Thou shalt do something harder still.—Stand up where thou dost stand,

Among the fields of dream land, with thy father hand in hand,  
And clear and slow, repeat the vow,—declare its cause and kind,  
Which, not to break in sleep or wake, thou bearest on thy mind.

*"Onora in sleep.*

"I bear a vow of wicked kind, a vow for mournful cause:  
vowed it deep, I vowed it strong—the spirits laughed applause:

The spirits trailed, along the pines, low laughter like a breeze,  
While, high atween their swinging tops, the stars appeared to freeze.

*" Evil Spirit.*

" More calm and free,—speak out to me, why such a vow was made.

*" Onora in sleep.*

" Because that God decreed my death, and I shrank back afraid.—  
Have patience, O dead father mine! I did not fear to die ;  
I wish I were a young dead child, and had thy company !  
I wish I lay beside thy feet, a buried three-year child,  
And wearing only a kiss of thine, upon my lips that smiled !

We break off abruptly, where it seems sacrilege to abbreviate ; every word is so beautiful. We shall not tell the issue. Then follows the " Rhyme of the Duchess May," most exquisite and withal most powerful ; " The Romance of the Swan's Nest," with a kind of innocent infantine beauty ; " Bertha in the Lane," very sad, but still sweeter ; " Lady Geraldine's Courtship," most noble, with a mighty sweep of verse, and a corresponding grandeur of feeling ; the wild passionate outcry of " the Runaway Slave ;" the deeply-pathetic " Cry of the Children," never surpassed, and not to be surpassed for lyrical freedom, and exceeding tenderness, and still more exceeding power. We quote one verse ; it is the factory children who are speaking : (we trust they are saved now:)—

" ' True,' say the young children, ' it may happen  
That we die before our time.

Little Alice died last year—the grave is shapen  
Like a snowball, in the rime.

We looked into the pit prepared to take her—

*Was no room for any work in the close clay :  
From the sleep wherein she lieth none will wake her.  
Crying, ' Get up, little Alice ! it is day.'*

If you listen by that grave, in sun and shower,

With your ear down, little Alice never cries !—  
Could we see her face, be sure we should not know her,

*For the smile has time for growing in her eyes,—*  
And merry go her moments, lulled and stilled in  
The shroud, by the kirk-chime !

*' It is good when it happens,' say the children,  
' That we die before our time.'*"

Was there ever keener pathos ? And one more verse :—

" For, all day the wheels are droning, turning,—  
Their wind comes in our faces,—

Till our hearts turn,—our hand, with pulses burning,  
And the walls turn in their places—

*Turns the sky in the high window blank and reeling—  
 Turns the long light that droppeth down the wall—  
 Turn the black flies that crawl along the ceiling—  
 All are turning, all the day, and we with all.—*  
 And all day, the iron wheels are droning;  
 And sometimes we could pray,  
 ‘O ye wheels,’ (breaking out in a mad moaning,)  
 Stop! be silent for to-day!”

We have not even space to enumerate our favourites: “The Fourfold Aspect;” “The Virgin Mary to the Child Jesus;” “To Plush my Dog,” sweet and tender, and cheerful-hearted; “The Cry of the Human,” passionate and powerful; “The Sleep,” mournfully holy; “Cowper’s Grave,” sublime in its deep tender pathos; “The Lady’s Yes,” “A Woman’s Short-comings,” “A Man’s Requirement,” all three happy strains; one of a higher order, “A Year’s Spinning,” rarely surpassed or equalled for its expression of deep grief; “Catarina to Camoens,” most tender of canzonets; and “Sonnets from the Portuguese,” the veil of which it behoves not us to rend away; suffice it to say, “they are beautiful exceedingly.” And that is *all*: all we can at least find a space for, and enough, in our judgment, to crown a lady Queen of Song; and that is Mrs. Browning. Certainly she is not a faultless poet; she deals too much in frequent double endings, some of which are strained and forced; she is apt to play Greek freaks with her English tongue; she is sometimes too weird; rarely too sentimental. And now, that we are about to leave her, we feel as if we had said nothing about her; nothing truly to the point. But necessity commands, and so we leave the theme.

Still more unjustly are we constrained to treat Miss Lowe; we had hoped to linger over some of her calm stately lyrics also; so self-possessed in their sadness. There is “Zareefa,” which gives its name to one volume, thus characteristically opening:—

“When I consider time’s unfolded page,  
 Where man his soul hath graven on each line,  
 And note his wrongs in every clime and age  
 To woman, *yet how evermore doth shine*  
*Her spirit over his, almost divine,*  
 When most reviled in goodness eminent;  
 I marvel much, and grieve, yet rest content.”

There is a slap in the face for male critics at starting! but we will not be rebuffed. The tale is a very graceful, though a sad one, most gracefully told. In strong contrast with Mrs. Browning, Miss Lowe is rarely outwardly impulsive; she gives you, mainly, results of past thoughts and emotions; does not fling her feelings forth in the very act of composition. Indeed, there is a



peculiar reserve about Miss Lowe's poetry in this respect, which distinguishes it from almost all other poetry written by ladies; but we are already lingering. The song, "Peace, O peace!" is a peculiarly characteristic strain, and very beautiful; we must cite it:—

"Peace, O peace! the air is still;  
Sighs are spent, and sorrow dead;  
Look around and take thy fill  
Of quiet joys around thee spread.—  
No! the past no power can break:  
Still its mournful memories wake,  
Every care is vain.  
Not till throbs thy pulse no more,  
Till life's fever'd dream be o'er,—  
Shalt thou rest from pain."

"The Burden of Britain," "Threnodia," "An Evening Ode," "The Vallisneria," "Milton," "The Departed," and other lyrics in this volume have a calm still beauty of their own.

But these lyrics are far inferior, in our judgment, to the two dramas we meant to have dilated on. First, that charming "Queen's Choice," so utterly void of all *aim* at power, and yet so full of the thing itself: the deepest seas are apt to be most still: but here this image is out of place, for this drama is sunny on the whole, and leaves a happy memory behind it. Yet more highly do we think of "the Prophecy of Balaam;" all the characters introduced are strongly individualized,—the mean and selfish, and yet strong-souled prophet, emblem of genius misapplied; the reckless warrior-youth, Zuriel; the wise and holy Thirza; the gentle Milcah; the fierce Prince of Midian; all are painted with a master-hand: all are truth itself. Here is power, and yielding tenderness, and subtle wisdom; strong sound sense being perhaps, after all, the most marked characteristic. We must conclude: some day or other, we trust yet, to do more justice to Miss Lowe; we cannot think the theme exhausted; indeed it has scarcely been touched.

One circumstance is very remarkable, connected with our subject; it is, that both these poetesses in their spheres, so far greater in the boldness and grandeur of their thoughts than their sister-singers,—are comparatively *learned*! both are good Greek scholars; Miss Lowe, we believe, is well read in Hebrew also:—has this aided to impart or sustain the grandeur which they do most undoubtedly possess? Can we draw an argument from this fact for making our young maidens classical adepts? We would not do that; but the fact, we think, should be recorded.

ART. V.—*The Works of JOHN JEWEL, D.D. Bishop of Salisbury.*  
*Edited by RICHARD WILLIAM JELF, D.D., Canon of Christ*  
*Church, and Principal of King's College, London; formerly*  
*Fellow of Oriel College.* In 8 vols. 8vo. Oxford: at the  
 University Press.

Was never man yet surely at debate  
 With Sapience, but that he did repent.  
 Who that is ruled by her high estate  
 Of his after witte, shall never be shent;  
 With walles sure she doth him fortifie  
 When it is nede to resist a contrarie.

So spake one of our old poets—Stephen Hawes, to wit—in his “Pastime of Pleasure;” and the latter words especially might be applied to the labours of Jewel against the Romanist, and those of Hooker against the Puritan,—contraries which had to be resisted, but at the same time contraries, which have met more than once “in the whirligig of time,” as South showed in his bitter but marvellous sermons, which are the standard of English prose, and which will meet again—*QUOD AVORTAT DEUS!*

But of this elsewhere, and at another time, if necessary. Meanwhile we have a word to say of John Jewel, sometime Bishop of Salisbury, who has been as fortunate in his Editor, as his pupil, Mr. Richard Hooker, the author (as honest Izaak Walton styles him) of those learned books of the laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. All readers of Jewel and Hooker have to thank Dr. Jelf and Mr. Keble for their labours; and it is fair to say, that the labour of editing works like these is immense, known only to those who have quarried in the same mines. As relates to the work at the head of this article, we have only to refer our readers to the “List of Authors and Editions,” at the commencement of the first volume—from which and from the foot notes they may draw a tolerably fair opinion of the quiet and patient research requisite to put forth to the world works like to those of the author of the “Apology for the Church of England,” and the “Defence of it against Harding.”

In the remarks which follow, we purpose to lay before our

readers the contents of this edition, together with such particulars as are to be gleaned from the Editor's Preface, a sketch of Jewel's Life, and, lastly, a few observations (warnings, if others please to construe them as such) upon Roman Catholic aggressions, and upon that implicit faith of theirs in unscriptural articles, as Lord Brooke says,

“ Binding men's minde with Earth's imposture line<sup>2</sup>.”

First, however, we beg to quote from a cotemporary,—as our researches have only tended to strengthen our own opinions—what is there said of this excellent Bishop by the divines of the seventeenth century—by those who “were honourable men in their generation,” and fully competent to form an unbiassed judgment.

“ One Father of our Church has been reserved, that he may be spoken of separately—spoken of, as these his brethren always spoke of him, turning aside whenever mention of him occurred, as if their pious humility would not allow them to pass without some token of gratitude and reverence, the recognized defender of the Church of England, Bishop Jewel. If one fault be enough to blot out a whole ‘angelic life,’ a life spent in the service of the Church, between his chapel and his study; if some hasty words are to condemn as unworthy of confidence the man who set an example to all, that in treating of holy things he did not ‘set abroad in print twenty lines, till he had studied twenty years’—then we may presume to speak lightly of Bishop Jewel. But not so the true and grateful and humble-minded sons of the Church of England. They will reverence him with Hooker, as ‘the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years;’ with Bilson, as ‘that learned Father;’ with Laud, as ‘that painful, learned, and reverend prelate;’ with Usher, as ‘*ὁ Μακαρίης* Juellus, ille nunquam satis laudatus episcopus;’ with Bancroft, as ‘a man to be accounted of as his name doth import, and so esteemed, not only in England, but with all the learned men beyond the seas, that ever knew him or saw his writings;’ with Morton, as ‘that admirable doctor in God's Church,’ ‘that godly Bishop,’ ‘whose name we acknowledge to be most honourable in the Church of Christ;’ with Montagu, as ‘that Jewel of England;’ with Cosen, as ‘that worthy and reverend prelate’ (*præstantissimus præsul*);’ with James, as ‘one of the most precious and peerless Jewels of these later times, for learning, knowledge, judgment, honesty, and industry;’ with Bramhall, as ‘that learned prelate;’ with Carlton, as ‘Master Jewel, the reverend Bishop of Salisbury, for piety and learning, the mirror of his time;’ with Hall, as ‘that precious

<sup>2</sup> Treatise of Human Learning.



Jewel of England,' 'whom moderate spirits may well hear,' 'who alone with all judicious men will out-weigh ten thousand Separatists;' with Field, as 'that worthy bishop;' with the Martyr Charles, as 'one whose memory he much revered, though he never thought him infallible;' with Heylin, as 'that most reverend and learned prelate, of whom I would not have you think, but that I hold as reverend an opinion, as you or any other, be he who he will;' with Godwin, as 'felicissimæ memoriæ;' with Bishop Bull, as 'clarissimus;' with Sancroft, as 'our reverend and learned Jewel;' with Stillingfleet, as 'that incomparable Bishop, 'that great light and ornament of his Church, whose memory is preserved to this day with due veneration in all Protestant Churches;' and lastly, with Whitgift, as 'that so notable a Bishop, so learned a man, so stout a champion of true religion, so painful a prelate;' 'pardon me,' he concluded, as we will conclude also, 'though I speak somewhat earnestly; it is in behalf of a Jewel that is contemned and defaced—he is at rest, and not here to answer for himself. Thus have I answered in his behalf, who, both in this and other like controversies, might have been a great stay to this Church of England, if we had been worthy of him. But whilst he lived, and especially after his notable and most profitable travails, he received the same reward of ungrateful tongues, that other men be exercised with, and all must look for that will do their duty<sup>3</sup>.'"

So spake the men of renown, famous in the congregation; and when Jewel's fair name has been lightly spoken of, we think it an act of justice to record their testimony in our pages. He whose Lyrics cleared Thebes of the imputation of intellectual cloudiness, said,—

ὁ μέγας κίνδυνος  
ἀναλκιν οὐ φῶ-  
τα λαμβάνει—"

and such was Jewel, in a time of great need, and when the doctrines of the Papacy were paraded as "the truth that is in Jesus." Great was the popularity of his writings then; nor, as Dr. Jelf expresses himself in his Preface, "has the popularity of his writings been confined to a few readers in his own generation, or to the solitary student of after times. His works have been the armoury from which polemical divines have borrowed their keenest weapons against the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome: and much of that wholesome dread of Popery, which is so deeply implanted in the English mind, might be traced perhaps to the copy of Bishop Jewel's works, which the foresight of Archbishop Bancroft chained side by side with Erasmus's Commen-

<sup>3</sup> Quart. Rev. vol. lxix. pp. 476, 477.

taries, for the instruction of the people, on a reading-desk provided for that especial purpose, in the side-aisle of many a parish church." Long may this wholesome dread of Popery remain! May we be enabled still to baffle the attempts of subtle foes within our own boundaries, as well as the open attacks of the Romanist from without! Say what men may—reason as they like—the spirit of the Seven Hills is the same spirit still—not laid, not cast out, not exorcised! It is with Rome as with individuals, whether Romanists or others,

Ἀνδρὸς χαρακτὴρ ἐκ λόγου γνωρίζεται.

But to turn to the Editor's Preface, wherein, after having informed us that he commenced his laborious work of correction "in conformity with a wish of the late Professor Burton"—(one out of many amongst the wise suggestions of that excellent man),—and after having dwelt upon the many imperfections of all preceding editions, which, in this instance, is most true; he proceeds to inform us of what are the contents and arrangement of the Edition before us. But, as this portion of the Preface is valuable, because it gives the real dates of what are called the *two controversies*, we propose laying it before our readers at length.

"The first six volumes of the present edition are equally divided between the two great controversies, in their natural order; the first division comprising the Challenge, the Short Reply to Cole, and the Replie to Mr. Harding's Answer; the second, the Apologie of the Church of England, and the Defence of the Apologie. The two last volumes contain the Commentary on the Thessalonians, the Sermons, the Treatises on the Scriptures and on the Sacraments, the Letters, and other miscellaneous writings. A copious general Index is subjoined,"—the reader will find it most useful—instead of the two inconvenient and imperfect ones, which preceded the "Replie" and the "Defence," in former Editions.

"It must be borne in mind, that *two controversies*, or rather, phases of the same controversy, between Bishop Jewel and Harding, though begun at different periods, were going on simultaneously, and in such a manner as nearly to alternate with each other. The Sermon at Paul's Cross, embodying the Challenge, had been first delivered in 1559; it was answered by Harding in 1563, and defended by Bishop Jewel in 1565. In the interval between the Challenge and the Answer, 'The Apologie of the Church of England' appeared (1562); the 'Confutation' of which by Harding was published in 1565, four months earlier than the publication of the 'Replie.' The first edition of the 'Defence of the Apologie,' came out in 1567, and was followed, in 1568, by Harding's 'Detection of sundry foul errors, &c.,' which produced Jewel's second and final edition of the Defence, as the close of the con-

troversy, in 1569<sup>4</sup>. This necessarily complicated statement will be elucidated by the following table, in which the works on either side are detailed in chronological order, those appertaining to the Challenge being printed in Italics :—

1. *Challenge Sermon at Paul's Cross.*  
       ———— first delivered, Nov. 26, 1559.  
       ———— repeated at Court, March 17, 1560, N. S.  
       ———— again at Court, March 31, 1560.  
       ———— imprinted at London by John Day, May 18, 1560.
2. *Dr. Cole's first Letter.* March 18, 1560.  
    *Correspondence between Cole and Jewel,* imprinted May 18, 1560.
3. *Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ.* 1562. (See note).  
    First Translation (attributed to Abp. Parker). 1562.
4. *Harding's 'Answere to M. Iuelles Challenge.'* 1563.
5. Lady's Bacon's Translation of 'the Apologie.' 1564.
6. *Harding's Confutation of a book entituled 'An Apologie of the Church of England.'* 1565.
7. *Jewel's Replie to Harding's Answere.* Aug. 1565.
8. *Harding's 'Rejoindre to M. Jewel's Replie.'* Aug. 31, 1566.
9. *Another Rejoindre to M. Jewel's Replie against the Sacrifice of the Mass.* 1567.
10. *Jewel's Defence of the Apologie.* Oct. 27, 1567.
11. *Harding's 'Detection of sundry foul errors uttered by M. Jewel in his Defence of the Apologie.'* 1568.
12. Second and enlarged edition of the 'Defence,' exposing also 'the Detection.' Dec. 1569.

It is to the neglect of the foregoing chronological distribution, that the confusion is to be described, which has prevailed even amongst well-informed writers, respecting the different portions of Jewel's works. It is nothing uncommon to find the controversy on the Challenge confounded with that on the Apology; and this want of discrimination has been greatly encouraged in the editions hitherto most accessible, viz., those of 1609 and 1611, by the singular perversity of bookbinders in placing the Defence of the Apology next after the Reply to Cole and the Sermon at Paul's Cross; an arrangement so general, even in copies still appearing in their original bindings, as almost to lead to the conclusion that the works were printed in that order. It may be here stated, that these two impressions, although so closely resembling each other as to give rise to the suspicion of a re-issue with a new title-page, appear, on a closer inspection, to have been independent editions, as is indicated by the fact, that the headings and contents of the pages, and even the errors of the press, do not always correspond; and that of the two editions the later is the less correct. It has been already intimated, that the first of these editions was issued by command of Archbishop

<sup>4</sup> "This is a sufficient answer to a writer under the name of Walsingham, who, amongst other gross and cunning falsehoods, has stated that the Detection was the last that passed between the two disputants."



Bancroft; and it is not unlikely that, the first impression being found insufficient for the supply of the parishes, the second was added in a form as nearly resembling it as possible. It must be owned that, considering the haste with which these reprints were prepared at a particular juncture, they represent correctly the text of the last edition revised by the author; and though of no value as critical editions, were yet sufficient to serve the immediate purpose which the Archbishop had in view—the general instruction of the people.”—*Editor's Preface*, pp. xii.—xvi.

All readers of Jewel's works, we think, will thank us for this lengthy extract. On referring to the book itself, they will find the statements well supported by the foot-notes; and although, at first sight, we fancied we had reason for some hesitation, a cautious examination of the whole subject has led us to acquiesce entirely in the Editor's views. No reader of Jewel, with the old folios before him, but must have been sorely puzzled, and have numbered himself, possibly, with the Dulhead and the Dulman family! But, as Bellanima says in Thomas Nabbe's *Microcosmus*, “All lets are now removed.”

It did not fall in with the Editor's views, either to write a life of Jewel, or to enter into any detailed examination of undeserved aspersions which have been thrown out against him, whether in or near his own days, or since the Romanist has unguardedly taken up the stop-gap of *Developement*<sup>5</sup> in preference to the old *Palladium* of Christian antiquity, which he so long claimed as his

<sup>5</sup> It may be observed in a note, that “*Developement*” has been more than once hinted at in days gone by; but, the ground being dangerous, was given up as untenable. Verily, there is nothing new under the sun! The following passage occurs in *Doctor Cole's Answer to Certain Parcels of the Second Letters, &c.* 8 Aprilis, anno 1560. “The Church of Christ hath his childhood, his manhood, and his hoar hairs: and, as that that is meet for a man in one age, is unmeet in another, so were many things meet, requisite, and necessary in the Primitive Church, which in our days were like to do more harm than good.” Vol. i. p. 64. To this Jewel makes answer in his reply, “Ye know that ye yourself, in your last answer, granted me that the examples of the Primitive Church are on our side, and therefore ye rest upon another point, that the Primitive Church in the Apostles' and old Doctors' time, was but an infant and babe in comparison of your Church of Rome,” &c. &c. Ibid. p. 85. In these and like instances, we see the germ, at least, of *Developement*, on which we had purposed saying something, had our limits admitted. Our readers are, no doubt, well aware, that the subject is taken up in America, and that the dangerous ground has been pointed out in “*Brownson's Quarterly Review*.” We may refer to a former Number for some very well-timed and grave remarks on this head. We suspect that very many are already sorry that they took to hallooing before they were out of the wood!

Τὸ καυχᾶσθαι παρὰ καιρὸν  
μαίναισιν ὑποκρέκει.

Pind. Olymp. ix. 58.

Something of this “*Developement*” may be observed in the works of Cardinal Cusanus. See the Defence, &c. pt. vi. c. 12. divis. 4. Of this Edition, vol. vi. p. 395—408.

own indefeasible right, in accordance with which all his faith was moulded, and the denial of which at Paul's Cross scared him almost from his propriety. "Imperfectly done," says Dr. Jelf, it "would be unjust to the author, and injurious to the cause of truth, to fulfil it adequately, even if it were in the Editor's power, would swell the present edition to an inconsistent size." One point, however, he has thought it right to dwell upon, and this we cannot do better than give in his own words.

"The only exception which demands notice, as taken against the tone and supposed tendency of some passages in Bishop Jewel's works, is not that of the open or secret adherent of the papacy—for to such an one the plain, straightforward, English strength of the author's polemics must ever be extremely distasteful—but that of some faithful and dutiful disciple of the Church of England, who, without intending to disparage one of her great lights, may be sensible of a difference between the theological school of Jewel, and that of others whose names are identified with the sober defence of Church government, in the succeeding generation. But even admitting such difference to exist, this were but another instance of the Divine protection extended over our Church, that it has pleased God, by raising up at sundry times special instruments for his service, to check at one period the innovations of Rome, at another the no less dangerous and uncatholic novelties of Geneva. And it is our wisdom, surely, no less than our duty, to accept and enjoy the different portion of our rich inheritance of theology. It may be that Bishop Jewel did not foresee the rise and fatal effects of Puritanism: he was engaged in defending one wing of the army of the faith, and he did not see clearly what was passing on the other; yet none of his acts or of the principles of his warfare were inconsistent with its subsequent defence by such an one as his great successor, the author of the 'Ecclesiastical Polity.' Nor ought it to be forgotten, that if he spoke contemptuously of Rome, it was from a clear appreciation of the primitive model, which she had forgotten or debased, and out of a single-hearted zeal for God's glory, which she had dishonoured and profaned: that while his intimate relations with foreign reformers, who had been his benefactors in exile, inclined him to speak hopefully and respectfully of their churches, as then constituted, he was by no means blind to the superior blessings, in respect of government and apostolic order, as well as of worship, which Divine Providence had vouchsafed to England: that he desired nothing more or less than the general restoration of catholic faith and practice, such as the Reformation in England had been providentially designed to secure; and finally, that, if in some matters, as, for instance, with respect to the habits, we may concede his argument to have been wrong, his conduct in his practical and official relations to the Church was dutiful and right."—*Editor's Preface*, pp. xxii.—xxiv.

Certainly, in the works of those two great theologians,—Jewel

and Hooker,—we have the very best armoury wherefrom to draw our weapons against the Romanist and the Puritan; and as long as we refer to them wisely, and without taking needless exceptions, the Papacy must quail, and the grand Mufti of Geneva (as South pointedly calls the Calvinist) give way;—provided we do not forget “that there is an Anti-Calvinism which is as much at variance with the doctrines of the Church of England and with Scripture, as the decrees of the Synod of Dort can be<sup>6</sup>.” The point to be remembered is, that neither Jewel nor Hooker are infallible; and, as regards individuals, SIMON PURE is not a whit the less cunning in his way than that august individual, POPE SELF. Had this been well considered, many a ponderous tome of polemics might have been comprised in an epitome. Who, on reading the conventional harshness of controversial language,—its angular points and its asperities,—whether Harding’s or others’, is not willing to exclaim, with the wise poet,—

“And in the best, where science multiplies,  
Man multiplies with it his care of minde:  
While in the worst, these swelling harmonies,  
Like bellows, fill unquiet hearts with winde,  
To blow the flame of malice, question, strife,  
Both into publicke states and private life?”

No doubt “wrangling Elenchs” will be necessary as long as the world lasts, and truths must be defended; but those things which make for peace leave no sting behind. And how, in the midst of controversy, must the amiable Jewel have longed for this peace! How did his heart burn within him when all was hubbub and confusion! “*Nur die Seele giebt den Masstab der Leiden!*” and, that he felt it, any one who reads his sermons will readily conclude. These the reader will find in the seventh volume of the present edition; and they are well worth a most careful perusal. All of them, it is true, are posthumous<sup>7</sup>, but there is every external evidence of their genuineness. Such passages as the following, illustrative of what has been said relative to Jewel’s desire for peaceful worship, are to be met with in the whole series;—little oases, as it were, when all around was tempestuous and sandy controversy and strife:—

Σὺν δ’ Ἐπίς, οὐρανόμενες ἀναστήσασα κάρηνον.

“By how much the heavens are greater than the earth, and God is more excellent than a creature, so much doth the knowledge of God and his true worship pass all worldly blessing, and all other felicity that can be devised under the sun. For what knoweth he, which knoweth not

<sup>6</sup> Short’s Sketch of the History of the Church of England, § 557.

<sup>7</sup> See Introductory Note, vol. vii, p. 434.



God? or what worshippeth he, which worshippeth not God? He that worshippeth not God, hath not the comfort of God: but he that hath God, and knoweth God, and serveth God, hath a sure help and defence in all assays. Let us therefore be glad and rejoice, let us witness our joy, and sing unto the Lord a new song. Let us kindle in our hearts the fire of the love of God, and of our neighbour, and let the flame thereof break out to the glory of God. Let us deck the altars of our hearts with the flourishing branches of virtue and good works: let us sacrifice and kill our lusts and affections. In this manner, if we shew our thankfulness towards God, we shall hinder the wretched purpose of them that wish the restoring of Jericho, we shall see the land of God's promise, and enter into his rest."—Vol. vii. p. 367.

It is in such passages as these, sparkling as they do—*Per quæstionum vincula, Per syllogismos plectiles*<sup>8</sup>—that we behold Jewel—as he would have been had he only had to visit from house to house, and to teach publicly in parochial ministration;—even as he did, many times and oft, when the diocese of Sarum was as blessed with his presence, as was Mona with that of the sainted Wilson;

“ Good men,

Who long served Heaven with praise, the world with prayer<sup>9</sup>!”

It was the former who said that, “like as the errors of the clock be revealed by the constant course of the sun, even so the errors of the Church are revealed by the everlasting and infallible Word of God;” the life and writings of the latter bore testimony to the same great truth. Indeed, the “*buccina Romæ*” never seems to have disturbed his quiet. In these his inestimable sermons when he touches upon Romish errors, he takes the high ground he knew was his own, and that of his Church, and he departs from it never. The parallel to Jewel's words occurs in his *Maxims of Piety and of Christianity*. “By the Holy Scriptures every man may see what he is, what he is not, and what he ought to be. Let us therefore meditate upon them, consult them as our rule, and make them evermore our pattern.”

But, impressed with the great value of Bishop Wilson's writings, we are wandering from our subject. Having, then, expressed our sentiments clearly as to the importance of Dr. Jelf's labours on Bishop Jewel's Works, we will now attempt a sketch of that excellent Prelate's Life, whose name will be held in honour as long as there is “any virtue, and if there be any praise.” It will be hardly necessary to say, that all the several Lives of Jewel are before us, in one shape or another; and that we draw from each what seems to our purpose; but we cannot avoid stating, that the one by

<sup>8</sup> Prudentius,

<sup>9</sup> Gondibert.

Mr. Le Bas is one to be put into the hands of all, being written in the kindest spirit, and with the soundest Church views.

JOHN JEWEL, one of ten children, sons and daughters, was born at Buden, in the parish of Berinber, that is Berryn-arbor, or Barinarber, as Godwin writes it, in the county of Devon, the 22nd of May, 1522. His father, though not a rich man, was a man still of some means, and of an ancient family. His mother's maiden name, whose memory he so fondly cherished, was Bellamy; and it was from his uncle John Bellamy, the incumbent of Hampton, that he received his earliest instruction in the rudiments of grammar. From thence he was removed successively to Bramton, Southmolton, and Barnstaple, where he was placed under the care of Walter Bowen, a pious and excellent man, whose name he never ceased to hold in honour. From his earliest years, Jewel seems to have been a promising youth, and it was natural enough that the advantage of a university education should be sought for him. Hear what Master Featley, "now" (in Fuller's days) "at rest with God," says of him, in the *Abel Redivivus*: "If ever any was happy in the imposition of names in those whom they dedicate to God at the Font, certainly they were who christened this holy and learned man *John Jewel*; for his rare and admirable parts, and both natural and supernatural gifts, were every way corresponding to his gracious and precious name. According to his Christian name *John*, signifying *grace*, he was a *gracious* instrument of Christ, to reform the gold of the sanctuary, which through the negligence or impiety of later times became dim and drossy with superstition. And according to his surname he was a rich *Jewel*, consisting of many *gems*, shining as well in his life, as his incomparable writings extant, almost in all languages."

Almost all who wrote or spoke of him when his fame became great, were in the habit of alluding to this play on his name; and doubtless he was a jewel to his parents, who, as was customary in those days, contrived to get him admitted at Merton College, Oxford, before he had completed his thirteenth year. A century later we may recollect that Milton was only fifteen when he entered on his residence at Christ's College, Cambridge<sup>10</sup>. Jewel's

<sup>10</sup> It is well known that Milton is said to have been whipped at Cambridge. Without entering on the disputed point, we subjoin his own lines to his friend Charles Deodate.

Jam nec arundiferum mihi cura revisere Camum,  
Nec dudum vetiti me laris angit amor,  
Nuda nec arva placent, umbrasque negantia molles,  
Quam male Phœbicolis convenit ille locus!  
Nec duri libet usque minas perferre Magistri  
Cæteraque ingenio non subeunda meo.

ELEG. i. 114.

[Humphrey

first tutor was Master Peter Burrey, afterwards preferred to the vicarage of Croydon—one, it is said, who was neither a person of great learning, nor much addicted to the Reformation. Happily he did not remain his pupil for long, but was made over to Mr. John Parkhurst, then a Fellow of Merton, afterwards promoted to the Rectory of Cleve, in the Diocese of Gloucester, and eventually the excellent Bishop of Norwich. In Featley's Abridgment of Humphrey's Life, prefixed to the folio edition of Jewel's Works, the exchange of pupils and the well-known subsequent exclamation of Parkhurst, is thus alluded to:—"But because (Master Burrey of Merton) had a post-master before (Divine Providence so disposing), by him he was recommended to Master Parkhurst, who, wanting one, most willingly received him into his tuition, and the place which he had in his gift; and being desirous, together with all wholesome learning, to season his tender years with pure religion, took occasion often before him, to dispute with Master Burrey about controverted points, and, intending to compare the translations of Coverdale and Tindal, gave him Tindal's translation to read, himself overlooking Coverdale. In which collation of translation Jewel oft smiled, which Master Parkhurst observing, and marvelling that in those years he could note barbarisms in the Vulgate translation, brake into these words: SURELY, PAUL'S CROSS WILL ONE DAY RING OF THIS BOY! prophesying, as it were, of that noble sermon of his at Paul's Cross, which gave such a blow to the superstitions of the Popish Mass, or rather to the whole mass of Popish superstition, that all the defenders of them have ever since staggered."

It was whilst he was a member of Merton College that he contracted that lameness which never left him, owing to a cold "he had caught him at Witney," or, as others say, "at a place called Croxham, in a lower chamber, where the College removed in the time of the plague in Oxford." Here, no doubt, as when in Oxford, he persevered in that intense study to which he had given himself up—from four in the morning till ten at night—and this, added to the damp of the chamber, is sufficient to account for his weakly constitution and his early death. None can overcharge the powers of the mind or the body with impunity, and those who will live two days in one, however goodly the intent, should bear in mind, that their days, which are but a span long, must, in the ordinary course of things, be contracted further still,—a point this which it were wise in parents to impress upon their sons, in these

Humphrey gives the story of "*Edvardus Annus*" (Edward Year's) whipping for his verses against the Superstition of the Mass. See Jewel's Life, p. 77, and Fuller's Church Hist. book viii. cent. xvi.



days when knowledge, after its sort, is increased. "Ἀπορον ἔλαβον χάριμα παῦροί τινες—but there is a moderation in every thing, and the wise and the thoughtful will see to it !

Four years Jewel remained at Merton, and then, by the procurement of one Mr. Slater, and Master Burrey and Parkhurst, his two tutors, he migrated to Corpus, the 19th of August, 1539, in his seventeenth year. He would seem to have been a prodigy in attainments, young as he was ; and at Corpus there was a better opening for him to distinguish himself, which, as it is very well known, he did, notwithstanding the envy of his equals, who often suppressed his ingenious exercises, and read others that were more like their own. The next year he proceeded to the degree of Bachelor of Arts, the 20th of October, 1540. And now commenced his excellent labours as Tutor of his College, in which office no one ever comported himself with greater exactitude, whether we look to the instruction of himself or others.

"Never," said that excellent man and prince of pædagogues, the late Bishop Butler, some time Master of Shrewsbury, but now with God, "do I presume to come in to instruct, without having carefully looked over the lesson on hand." And so thought Jewel, and first he taught himself, and then others. Like Erasmus and Bishop Sanderson, he was a devoted lover of Horace ; and every one who reads the *Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, will see at once how dear Cicero was to him, and how his style is imbued with the purest Latinity. "At the same time," adds Mr. Le Bas, "the practice of Demosthenes suggested to him the discipline by which he might best prepare himself for public speaking ; only that the woods of Shotover, instead of the ocean-beach, were the scenes of his solitary exercises in declamation. By labours and arts like these, he acquired the habit of expressing himself with facility and force when called upon by sudden occasions, and with copiousness and dignity when time for preparation was allowed. History and philosophy, logic and mathematics, all were concluded in his scheme of study ; and the whole of his vast acquisitions were made, eventually, subservient to the mistress of all sciences, Theology." In fact, even now, his thoughts were toward that great end and aim of his life ; for, says Master Featley, "being but a Bachelor, he sifted much of the flour of St. Augustine with divine aphorisms." And his life was in accordance with his studies, so that even Master Moren, Dean of the College, and no friend to the Reformation, was constrained to say, "I should love thee, Jewel, if thou wert not a Zuinglian. In thy faith I hold thee a heretic, but surely in thy life thou art an angel. Thou art very good and honest, but a Lutheran !"

Meanwhile, though but a Bachelor, the Rhetoric Lecture was conferred upon him by his college, and both as private tutor and lecturer, he gained no common name. It is delightful to read the eulogium passed on him in the former capacity by Humphrey—his devotedness to his pupils—his entire love for them—his care of their morals and studies.

Such was his manner of teaching, such the persuasion with which he spoke, that even his own teachers became his hearers. Hear again what Master Featley says, in Humphrey's words and his own. The Rhetoric Lecture "he read with such facility and felicity, that all his auditors perceived that he spake *potius ex arte*, than *de arte Rhetoricâ*, rather from an excellent faculty that he had in that *flexanimous* art, than of the art itself. Neither were these his lectures only *strewed* as it were with flowers of rhetoric, but richly fraught with all variety of human learning; which drew many auditors to him from other colleges, and among them his tutor Master Parkhurst, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, who took great delight to behold the *sparkling* of that *diamond*, which himself had first *pointed*; and he could not contain his joy, but vented it on the sudden in this extempore disticon:—

"Olim discipulus mihi, care Juelle, fuisti;  
Nunc ero discipulus, te renuente, tuus."

It was during this period that, amongst others, Mr. Antony Parkhurst became his pupil, though the connection was almost immediately dissolved, owing to the influence of one Robert Serles, Vicar of St. Peter's. It is alluded to here, because the reason assigned was, Jewel's teaching of Greek, which shows that the words of Erasmus respecting Germany were still true, more or less, as regarded England, *Literas Græcas attigisse hæresis erat!* "It was worth notice (says Knight in his Life of Colet<sup>1</sup>) that Standish, who is a bitter enemy to Erasmus, in his declamation against him, styles him *Græculus iste*; which was a long time after the phrase for an heretic, or one falling under the suspicion of heretical pravity. And for this very reason, those very few who understood Greek were afraid to teach it, lest they should be thought to propagate heresy." The readers of that old morality "Lusty Juventus," will observe how the learning of the new Gospellers, as those were called who favoured the Reformation, was

<sup>1</sup> We would recommend to all students this Life, and his Life of Erasmus, together with that most interesting piece of biography, Churton's Life of Alexander Nowel, the "Piscator Hominum," and friend of learning.

every where spoken against. A well-known character there utters this complaint:—

“ Oh, oh, ful wel I know the cause  
That my estimacion doth thus decay ;  
The olde peple would beleve stil in my lawes,  
But the yonger sort lead them a contrary waye ;  
They will not beleve, they playnly saye  
In old traditions and made by men,  
But they wyll lyve as the Scripture teacheth them.”

The 9th of February, 1544, Jewel commenced Master of Arts, the charges of his degree being borne by his old tutor and constant friend, Mr. John Parkhurst, of Cleve. Nor was this the only instance of his liberality, for it appears that he was in the habit of inviting him there twice or thrice in a year. “ And one time above the rest,” says the current story, “ coming into his chamber in the morning, when he was to go back to the university, he seized upon his and his companion’s purses, saying, ‘ What money, I wonder, have these miserable and beggarly Oxfordians?’ and, finding them pitifully lean and empty, stuffed them with money, till they became both fat and weighty.”

When Jewel entered into Holy Orders has not been ascertained, nor yet the time of his election to a fellowship at Corpus, where he spent the quietest period of his life. “ Halcyonian days,” as one of his biographers calls them. But, all this while, he was clearly looked upon as the friend of the Reformation; and, his receipts as Fellow not being enough to help him to promote the great work he had in hand, he received sundry sums from the well-wishers of the cause, which, though now they may appear small, were at that time considerable. Amongst these benefactors were Mr. Curtop, formerly a Fellow of Corpus, but now Canon of Christ Church, who allowed him forty shillings per annum; and Mr. Chambers, who put at his disposal six pounds yearly, out of the fund collected in London for “ the benefit of indigent scholars, professing the doctrines of the Reformation.” This allowance was a specific one, and such as received it were obliged to sign certain articles condemnatory of Romish tenets, such as the Supremacy of the Pope, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Justification by Works, Purgatory, Praying to the Saints, Worship of Images, Religious Service in a tongue unknown to the people, and, lastly, the refusal of the Sacramental Cup to the Laity. Jewel, of course, must have signed them. In fact, we know from the Life of Humphrey, that he was pitched upon by Mr. Chambers, to advocate the principles of the Reformed faith; and the substance of his discourse is extant,



and henceforward he becomes prominent as a leader, as well literary as theological.

And now it was that a turning point in his life is to be reckoned—his intimacy with Peter Martyr, who, within two years after the accession of Edward VI., was made Professor of Divinity at Oxford. Nothing could be more close than the intimacy that subsisted between these two earnest men, and it continued to the last. Meanwhile Jewel became one of his constant hearers ;—"observed," says Master Featley, "his art, copied out his sermons and lectures, was his notary in that tumultuous disputation in the Divinity School, with Cheddey, Tresham, Morgan, and others about the Divine Presence." As is well known, he was skilled in short hand, and it was this same skill which enabled him to take down the famous debate of Cranmer and Ridley, which preceded their condemnation in 1554.

It appears from Wood's *Fasti Oxon.* that Jewel was admitted B.D. in 1551 ; and it was upon this occasion that he preached the celebrated Latin Sermon on 1 Pet. iv. 11, *Siquis loquitur, quasi sermones Dei, &c.*<sup>2</sup> His license for preaching was granted this year, as may be seen in Strype ; and he now accepted the living of Sunningwell, that he might labour in his vocation, and do the work of an Evangelist amid a country congregation. Here, notwithstanding his lameness, he went on foot at least once every fortnight to preach, continuing to do the same both privately in college and in the university pulpit. In the university and out of it, Jewel had now a name ; and shortly after, in 1552, on Dr. Morvent, the President of Corpus, being summoned to appear before the Privy Council, the government of the college was committed by their order to Jewel during the six weeks of his absence.

Meanwhile, "unseen, like mandrakes wedded under ground," dark days had been gathering. Edward the Sixth, whether, as one says, he went or was sent to his grave, was no more. July 6, 1553, Mary, surnamed the Bloody, began her reign ; and a sore time was it for those unto whom the title of Gospellers attached. And such was Jewel. Nay, more, his place was in the van. Accordingly, he had to stand the first shock ; and almost immediately we find him ejected from his college as the follower of Peter Martyr,—as a preacher of heresy,—as ordained uncanonically,—as a despiser of the Mass.

"The secret grudge and malice will remain :  
The fire not quenched, but kept in close restraint,  
Fed still within, breaks forth with double flame<sup>3</sup>."

<sup>2</sup> See vol. viii. p. 221, &c. of this edition.

<sup>3</sup> Gorboduc.

And so it was. The ornament of his College must quit. Yet, those who ejected him, through fear and interest combined, could not deny him the last opportunity of addressing those whom he had taught so faithfully; and most affecting is the address contained in the pages of his earliest biographer, and which, did our space admit, we should most willingly extract<sup>4</sup>; but we must content ourselves with the concluding words: *Valeant studia, valeant hæc tecta, valeat sedes cultissima literarum, valeat jucundissimus conspectus vestri, valete juvenes, valete socii, valete fratres, valete oculi mei, valete omnes, valete!* "Thus," says Master Featley, "he burst out of his speech, and his hearers burst out into tears."

It has been remarked as strange, that Jewel should not at once have perceived, that neither Oxford nor even England were now safe places for him. The probabilities are, that he was fully alive to the fact; but that, being told to depart, he put it off as long as possible. In the interim he was received within the walls of Bradgates Hall, since the chancellorship of the Earl of Pembroke better known by the name of Pembroke College, his own body bitterly repenting the course they had taken, and for which indeed they were twitted by Dr. Wright, Archdeacon of Oxford, who, upon their boasting that their College alone, among all the university, had kept their Church treasure and ornaments entire, closely laid up in their vestry, admitted indeed the fact, but added, "that they had thrown away wilfully one ornament and great treasure, more precious than any of them," obviously alluding to Jewel. The university likewise, even at such a conjuncture, was of the same opinion, for they deputed him, Gospeller as he was, to address a letter of congratulation to the Queen. There is no just cause to suppose, with Fuller (Book viii.), that this appointment was the work of his enemies. With some, no doubt, as hinted at before, secret grudge and malice had their resting-place, but the sense of the university at large was in his favour. Whether or not, Jewel acted wisely in penning the letter "warily, and in general terms." It might do good,—it could do no harm; and, as Fuller remarks, "all as yet were confident that the Queen would maintain the Protestant religion, according to her solemn promise to the gentry of Norfolk and Suffolk." We give the story of the great bell of Christ-Church in the old historian's words, which (although he draws all his statements from Humphrey) are quite characteristic.

"And because every one was accounted a truant in Popery who did

<sup>4</sup> The reader may see the substance of it in Wordsworth's *Eecl. Biogr.* vol. iii. p. 330, and in Le Bas, p. 21, 22.

not outrun the law, Dr. Tresham, an active Papist and a van-courier before authority, repaired the great bell in Christ-Church, which he new-named and baptized Mary ; and, whilst Mr. Jewel was reading the letter he had penned to Dr. Tresham for his approbation thereof, presently that bell tolled to Mass (a parenthesis which was not in the letter), and Tresham, breaking off his attention to what was written, exclaimed in a zealous ecstasy, 'Oh! sweet Mary, how musically, how melodiously doth she sound!' This bell then rung the knell for that time to the truth in Oxford, henceforward filled with Protestant tears and Popish triumphs."

We have before stated, that we believe Jewel to have been alive to the danger he was in ; and we need not wonder that he should have been, when the basilisk eye of Marshall, Dean of Christ Church, was upon him. Peter Martyr<sup>5</sup>, it seems, had left, and the Dutch congregation in London had departed for Denmark. And so Jewel casts about for a friend ; and, in the midst of frost and snow, and crippled with lameness, he goes in search of his old benefactor and tutor, Dr. Parkhurst, of Cleve. Arrived there, he finds that he had fled. The Mass restored, there was no place of rest for him in Gloucestershire. And thus, weary and heart-sick, Jewel had to retrace his steps, and again we find him in Oxford. Subsequent to this visit, Jewel wrote two letters to his old friend, headed severally "*Juellus Parkhursto*," which are still extant, but without the date of the year<sup>6</sup>, and expressing ignorance of his locality ; so that we have no means of knowing how they were transmitted, or how they came to hand. As Jewel acted with Gilbert Mounson as notary in behalf of Cranmer and Ridley during their Disputation at Oxford, the next sad incident in his life dates subsequently to April 1554. It scarcely needs to say that, what is here alluded to is, the joy of his enemies, THE JOY OF BACK-FRIENDS TO PROTESTANTISM, —his apostasy!

Without being able to give an explicit and definite date, it is enough to say, that no long time after this the Philistines were upon him, with the renegade Marshall at the head of them. Full sure, they had watched their time and opportunity, and when his body was weak and his mind harassed and distressed, like Cranmer's, there is sent by the inquisitors a bead-roll of Popish doc-

<sup>5</sup> Notwithstanding the virulency of Tresham, Peter Martyr contrived to find a place of refuge with Cranmer at Lambeth. As the public faith was pledged for his safety, even Gardiner hastened his departure, and he reached Strasburgh in safety on the 30th of October, 1553. Le Bas, p. 38. Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog. iii. p. 334.

<sup>6</sup> See vol. viii. pp. 108, 109, where they are reprinted from Strype. Dr. Jelf brackets the date as 1554, which we believe to be correct.



trines, to be subscribed by him upon pain of fire and fagot, and other grievous torture. Some taunt, it is likely, was uttered about his caligraphy, or this saddest of all playfully painful sentences had not been uttered: "*Have you a mind to see how well I can write?*"

Whereupon he took the pen and unwillingly and hastily wrote his name. Those who call to mind similar expressions, under different circumstances,—such as those of Anne Bullen, or Sir Thomas More—will know how to count the bitterness of sore distress with which they are uttered; and who recollects not how Hannibal's heart was wrung, after Zama's fight, and when he laughed aloud, and was reproved for it, how he made answer,—*Si, quemadmodum oris habitus cernitur oculis, sic et animus intus cerni posset, facile vobis adpareret, non latere, sed prope amentis malis cordis hunc, quem increpatis, risum esse?*<sup>7</sup>

"Ah! nought is pure. It cannot be denied  
That virtue still some tincture has of vice!"

Thus fell JOHN JEWEL, one of the tallest and most promising cedars in the infant reformed Church, and the Romanist rejoiced, and believed his retraction—not a whit! And from that time to this the wolf in sheep's clothing has used his name as a by-word! Even then scorn and derision, perhaps, overwhelmed the comfort of the pitiful! At any rate, he must escape for his life; and, though we do not know exactly how long he remained in Oxford after his recantation, this we *do* know, that had he abided there one night more after the resolution to depart was taken, or had he gone the right way to London, the blood-hounds let slip by the turn-coat Marshall would have caught him. As it was, he was well-nigh lost, and, humanly speaking, owed his life to old Latimer's faithful servant, afterwards a minister of the Gospel,—Augustin Berner, a Switzer. By him he was found lying upon the ground, almost dead with vexation, weariness (for this lame man was forced to make his escape on foot), and cold; and, setting him upon a horse, conveyed him to the Lady Ann Harcups, a widow, who entertained him for some time, and then sent him up to London, where he was in more safety. There, having been thrice obliged to change his lodgings, he remained, till, by the kindness of Sir Nicholas Throgmorton, a passage was procured for him across the seas. Further particulars are not at hand. It is enough to state that he arrived at Frankfort, the then refuge of the persecuted Reformers, in July or August 1555.

Reader! art thou inclined to join in with the hunts-up (Shak-

<sup>7</sup> Liv. lib. xxx. c. 44.

speare, and Drayton in his *Polyolbion*, are our authority for the term) that have endeavoured to cry down the name of this holy man? If so, we recommend thee, on thy knees, to offer up that prayer of Cranmer's, which he devised for his own comfort, or ever he was taken to the stake! It will teach thee to be humble-minded, and, when thou thinkest thou standest, to take heed of falling! Fuller's spirit, be sure, was rightly tempered when he wrote: "Thus the most orient jewel on earth hath some flaws therein. To conceal this his fault had been partiality; to excuse it, flattery; to defend it, impiety; to insult over him, cruelty; to pity him, charity; to admire God in permitting him, true devotion; to be wary of ourselves in the like occasion, Christian discretion:" and that person of quality<sup>8</sup> who wrote *Jewel's Life* in 1685, and spoke of his works as being 'superannuated or neglected,' penned no better sentences than these: "It is an easy thing for those that were never tried, to censure the frailty of those that have truckled for some time under the shock of a mighty temptation: but let such remember St. Paul's advice, '*Let him that standeth, take heed lest he fall.*' This great man's fall shall ever be my lesson, and, if this glittering jewel were thus clouded and foiled, GOD BE MERCIFUL TO ME A SINNER!"

To say, even though merely stating facts without imputing motives, that "Jewel was a staunch Protestant, when Protestantism was in vogue; in time of trial away went his Protestantism all in a moment; among kindred spirits, and in a calmer time, he was a Protestant again; and he died bishop of Salisbury<sup>9</sup>;" is but *nigri succus loliginis*. We estimate Jewel's character otherwise!

"Non, siquid turbida Roma

Elevet, accedas: examenve improbum in illâ

Castiges trutinâ<sup>1</sup>."

But it is time to follow Jewel to Frankfort—the refuge of the Protestant fugitives. And here the first thing we read of is, the retractation of his subscription at St. Mary's, Oxford. As he subscribed to the Articles publicly, so he renounced them publicly. This, it is said, he did at the solicitation of Thomas Sampson, late Dean of Chichester, and Mr. Chambers, whose name we have referred to before; and Humphrey, Strype, Le Bas, and others, fall in with this view. But Jewel himself, in his "Reply" to Cole, who twitted him with the fact, says, "I have confessed it openly

<sup>8</sup> This *Life*, from which we have drawn largely, is reprinted in Wordsworth's *Eccles. Biog.* vol. iii. p. 307, &c. new ed. The author is unknown.

<sup>9</sup> The *British Critic*, No. lix. p. 14.

<sup>1</sup> Pers. Sat. i. v.

and *unrequired* in the midst of the congregation<sup>2</sup>." The two statements are easily reconciled. Jewel might himself have *suggested* the course he took; and in this his friends would naturally back him. So or not,—on the very next Sunday after his arrival, as Master Featley abridges Humphrey, "he made an excellent sermon, and in the end of it openly confesses his fall, in these words: '*It was my abject and cowardly mind and faint heart, that made my weake hand to commit this wickedness.*' Which, when he had brought forth with a gale of sighs from the bottom of the anguish of his soul, and had made humble supplication for pardon, first to Almighty God, whom he had offended, and afterwards to his Church, which he had scandalized; no man was found in that great congregation who was not pricked with compunction, and wounded with compassion; or who embraced him not ever after that sermon as a most dear brother, nay as an angel of God. So far was this saint of God from accounting sophistry any part of the science of salvation, or justifying any equivocating shifts, which are daily hatched in the school of Anti-christ." We give the words as they stand, not in the Abel Redivivus, but prefixed to the folio edition, 1611.

Jewel's abode at Frankfort was but for a little while. Peter Martyr, after his escape from England, had returned to his former residence in Strasburg; and no sooner did he learn that Jewel was safe, than he entreated him to come to him there. Jewel had, as we have seen, suffered for his intimacy with Peter Martyr; and the latter had a grateful and a capacious heart, and the invitations "*to Argentine*" were pressing and frequent. The result was, that Jewel became his inmate, and the two friends were united once more in kindred pursuits. "There was at Strasburg," says Churton, "a college of English,"—(*in hoc literalissimo Collegio*, are Humphrey's words)—"who had a common table, and devoted themselves to the pursuit of literature, with great harmony and great ardour. Jewel was here, and Nowel was here, and Poinet, Bishop of Rochester (afterwards of Winchester), and Grindal and Sandys, afterwards successively Archbishops of York; nor did the learned laymen, Sir John Cheke, Sir Richard Morison, Sir Peter Carew, Sir Thomas Worth, and others disdain to hear Peter Martyr expounding Aristotle's ethics and the Book of Judges<sup>3</sup>." Thus was passed the time of his sojourn at Frankfort; and in Jewel we still behold the scribe who prepared Peter Martyr's Commentary on the book of Judges for the press.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. i. p. 99 of this edition. Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. pt. i. p. 231.

<sup>3</sup> Life of Nowel, p. 22, &c.



At this time a great man died at Zurich, Conrad Pellicanus, the Hebrew Professor there, next to Reuchlin considered the first Hebrew scholar in Germany. Upon this the senate of the Ligurines sent for Peter Martyr to succeed him. The invitation was accepted, and he removed there, not without Jewel, the 13th of July, 1556. Here likewise, as at Strasburg, he was domesticated with his friend, and here also he found other sufferers. Amongst them were John Parkhurst, Laurence Humfrey<sup>4</sup>, his friend and earliest biographer, and James Pilkington, afterwards bishop of Durham. Humfrey extols the great hospitality and kindness of the magistrates of this town; and it is well known that but for their liberality and the alms of the London merchants, through the procurement of Chambers, the exiles must have starved. Fitting is it that their names should be preserved as they have been! But even this pittance was at length cut off through the intervention of Stephen Gardiner, who, on finding it out, declared that "he would in a short time make them eat their fingers' ends for hunger!" Happily his power was not equal to his malice. Something, no doubt, still oozed out from England; the *incredibilis humanitas* of the senate of the Ligurines supplied more; and a friend was raised up in Christopher, Prince of Wittenberg, who invited many of them to him.

It has been supposed that Jewel made his journey to Padua during the period of his residence at Zurich. He alluded to his studying there at the commencement of the celebrated letter to Scipio, the Venetian senator, *de Concilio Tridentino*, in these words: "Scribis ad me familiariter pro eâ consuetudine, quæ inter nos semper summa fuit ex eo usque tempore, quo unâ viximus Pataviæ, tu in Reipublicæ tuæ tractatione occupatus, ego in studiis literarum<sup>5</sup>." It seems most probable that the supposition is true; but, if so, we must again suppose that Jewel had his purse replenished, whether by the generosity of the London merchants, or the Ligurines, or that of Peter Martyr. But it would not be consistent with the statement of Humfrey to consider his absence of long duration, as he states that Jewel remained with Peter Martyr at Zurich till the time of his return to England. We may observe here, that Dr. Jelf in his Preface decides in favour of the genuineness of the letter here alluded to, which leads him likewise to add:—

"The fact also of Jewel's sojourn at Padua has been called into question; and an attempt has been made to show, from a comparison

<sup>4</sup> See Strype's Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. pt. i. 232. He was with the twelve original comers to Zurich. They lived "together in the house of Christopher Froscovers printer, and paid each for his ordinary."

<sup>5</sup> Vol. viii. p. 73 of this edition,

of dates, that there is no period during his exile which would admit of his visiting Italy at all. But the notices of his proceedings during those years are too scanty to justify any such conclusion; and it may well be believed that the 'good horse' which he gave to Richard Hooker,—the staff which had supported him in his wanderings through many parts of Germany,—would have carried him across the Alps, particularly when we consider that Padua was the university of his intimate friend and protector Peter Martyr."—p. xxviii.

Previous to Jewel's residence at Zurich, the exiles there had been addressed in consolatory letters both by Calvin and by Peter Martyr, which may be seen in Humphrey; but on his coming there he took upon himself to comfort and support them, by every means in his power. "And if," says Master Featley, "he heard any, more grievously than others, groaning under the burden of his affliction, and seeking to cast it off, he persuaded him to patience; admonishing him that he ought not to leap from the smoke into the fire, that we all ought to bear a part of Christ's cross, by whomsoever it be imposed, that now, when our brethren suffer extreme tortures in England, we must not look to live deliciously in banishment, shutting up all with that sweet close often repeated by him: *Hæc non durabunt ætatem: Bear a while, these things will not endure an age.*" These his words were listened to by the mourners then, and afterwards they looked upon them as "something like prophetic strain." The fact is, there was a general expectation that the revival of Popery in England, and its consequent cruelties, could not be of long duration; and, as we can see now clearly enough, its very supporters were bringing about that consummation so ardently desired by the exiles. The well-known story of Fox the Martyrologist's sermon told how earnestly they looked for the wish of their heart to be true! *Now was the time come*, said he, *for this their return into England, and he brought them that news by the commandment of God.* Rightly enough was he censured by the graver divines then present; but it so fell out, that Mary died the day before<sup>6</sup>!

Still, exiles though they were, they had their lives given them for a prey; and it might have been expected that their time would have been spent at least in religious peace, such as this world neither gives, nor taketh away. Alas! how little do we know the weakness of our nature! Let the time-honoured author of the Ecclesiastical Sketches speak of what was now to ensue.

"Scattering, like birds escaped the fowler's net,  
Some seek with timely flight a foreign strand;  
Most happy, reassembled in a land

<sup>6</sup> The story occurs in John Fox's Life, by his son. It may be seen in the Eccl. Biog. vol. iii. p. 337. It was inserted on the authority of Bp. Aylmer, who heard it.

By dauntless Luther freed, could they forget  
 Their country's woes? But scarcely have they met,  
 Partners in faith, and brothers in distress,  
 Free to pour forth their common thankfulness,  
 Ere hope declines; their union is beset  
 With speculative notions rashly sown,  
 Whence thickly sprouting growth of poisonous weeds;  
 Their forms are broken staves; their passions steeds  
 That master them. How enviably blest  
 Is he who can, by help of grace, enthrone  
 The peace of God within his single breast!"

Differences, it is well known, now arose on the subject of ceremonies and Church discipline, which the exiles brought, not from England, "but, like scattered seed, they received from the nature of the place and soil where they were dispersed;" though it is asserted by Heylin, that Wittingham, Williams, and Goodman, the chief promoters of the movement at Frankfort, were Zwinglians before they left. Whether or not, from Frankfort the epidemic spread to Zurich, and, in the stead of peace amongst those whom sorrow should have bound the closer, there was dissension. The originator of this discord, which spread from Geneva to Frankfort, and so onwards to other places, was that great author of confusion, Mr. John Calvin, of whom Hooker, whilst opposing him, declares: "for mine own part, I think him incomparably the wisest man that ever the French church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him<sup>7</sup>." Look where we will amongst our great divines, and we shall find one and all admitting his ability. South even, who saw the ruinous working out of his principles, ending in Socinianism, and bringing in misrule, admits it; coupling his name with Erasmus, Melancthon, Politian, and Budæus<sup>8</sup>, names that stood out in the boldest relief as the mists of ignorance and error gathered up. Admitting, however, his great powers, and the value of his commentaries<sup>9</sup>, where particular doctrines do not interfere—it must be admitted that a greater schismatic never rent the Church of Christ in latter days. To which we may add, that wherever Low Church views, such as his, are encouraged in high places or in low, there will be, as a necessary harvest, confusion and every evil work. Let those who wish to see this fully propounded study the immortal Hooker!

<sup>7</sup> Preface, c. ii. § 1. Origin of the New Discipline.

<sup>8</sup> See Sermons, vol. iii. p. 467. Of his anti-monarchical doctrine and assertions he speaks at length in p. 544—546, dubbing him with the title of THE GRAND MUFTI OF GENEVA, than which no happier one could have been devised.

<sup>9</sup> We have cautiously, and more than once over, examined the Archbishop of Canterbury's "EXPOSITION" with Calvin's Harmony and Commentary, and none would be more ready than his Grace to acknowledge his obligations.



Into this controversy our limits will not permit us to enter. Let it be enough to say that, as early as 1554, the exiles at Frankfort framed themselves a Liturgy and Order of Service, addressing likewise a letter to those scattered abroad in Strasburg, Zurich, Embden, and other places, and inviting them to come where "God's Providence had procured them a Church free from all *dregs of superstitious ceremonial*." Their answer was, that they would adhere to "the order last taken in the Church of England"—and that they were "fully determined to admit and use no other." This reply, and others like, were of no avail; and the fray was only thickened by the evil counsel of John Knox, afterwards so well known as the "great incendiary of Scotland." Other letters now passed, and the men of Frankfort wrote to the men of Zurich an open defiance of the English formularies. Grindal and Chambers attempted in vain to rule the strife, sent from Strasburg for that purpose. Letters to that intent were equally unavailing, whilst Knox and Wittingham were at work in secret, and when the reply of Calvin, whom they had taken upon themselves to apply to, though it contained no virulence equal to theirs, yet described the Prayer Book as containing *multas tolerabiles ineptias*. Things continued pretty much in this state till the March of the following year, when Dr. Richard Cox entered Frankfort, drove Knox out, and re-settled the Liturgy there. All this, nevertheless, was of little avail, for although in the August following, "Fox, with some few others, went to Basil," the main body followed Knox and Goodman to Geneva, and chose them for their preachers; under which ministry they rejected the whole frame and fabric of the Reformation made in England in King Edward's time, and conformed themselves wholly to the fashions of the Church of Geneva. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ!* Division of every sort and kind—lack of all charity and harmony—Socinianism, in its various phases—and, in due time, "THE GREAT REBELLION!" Those who sowed to the wind left the whirlwind to be reaped!

Meanwhile, as may be supposed, Jewel was no easy spectator of these sad divisions. His visit to Padua may have helped to divert his wearied spirit; but, for the most part, his heart must have been rent to think how, every where, so to say, the exiles were devouring one another. That he made an open complaint against Knox we know, but few particulars have come down to us relative to the pains he took to still the storm. Residing with Peter Martyr, no doubt he had the best advice, and took the wisest course—allowance being made for his friend and benefactor's learning, to such alterations as he had probably<sup>10</sup> suggested in

<sup>10</sup> On this, perhaps, questionable point, see Dr. Cardwell's Preface to The Two Liturgies of Edw. VI. compared.

the Liturgy before he quitted England. "These small jarring things," says Master Featley, "which have so much troubled the sweet harmony of our Church, he then sought by all means to put in tune, exhorting them, as brethren, to lay aside all strife and emulation, especially about such small matters; lest thereby they should greatly offend the minds of all good men: which thing, he said, they ought to have a principal care of." Sure we may be, that such distraction ill suited Jewel's well-regulated mind.

"His brest was hole withouten for to seen,  
But in his herte ay was the arwe kenel!"

But happier and better days were now approaching, and the exiles were to be free in body, though many a mental chain was yet to warp their efficiency: "God," as Hooker writes, "whose property is to strew his mercies then greatest when they are nearest to be utterly despaired of, caused, in the depth of discomfort and darkness, a most glorious star to arise, and on her head settled the crown, whom himself had kept as a lamb from the slaughter of these bloody times; that the experience of his goodness in her own deliverance might cause her merciful disposition to take so much the more delight in saving others whom the like necessity should press<sup>1</sup>." Mary, in fact, was no more. On the 17th of November, 1558, Elizabeth succeeded to the throne.

The news soon spread. In January, 1559, we find Jewel at Strasburg, on his way to England; for, in a letter addressed to Peter Martyr, dated the 26th of that month, he tells him that many had already reached him, and that "*reditum illorum reginæ esse gratissimum, idque illam non obscure præ se ferre*<sup>2</sup>." She had, however, interdicted preaching, whether by Papist or Gospeller, and, as we can see now, there was reason enough for her caution. When Jewel arrived is not quite clear; but, as he dates his next letter to Peter Martyr the 20th of March, it could not be long after; and it was previous to that of his old friend and benefactor Parkhurst, who, doubting the safety of Jewel's route, took another, and was robbed by the way, thus giving Jewel the happy opportunity of assisting him on his return. All, or nearly so, were in a bad plight, as may be readily supposed, and more or less dependent

<sup>1</sup> See Eccl. Pol. book iv. xiv. 7. He is there taking a view of God's special providence over England since the Reformation. The praises lavished on Elizabeth must be received *cum grano salis*; but we are very far from being of the number of those who take upon themselves to decry her. "The bright Occidental Star," to say the least, was a mighty Queen. Bp. Short throws out a wise hint, where he says, "the first principles of toleration were then unknown, either in Church or State; but toleration is a plant of Protestant growth, and all true Christians may join in the prayer, that her 'branches may cover the earth.'"—Short's Sketch, &c. § 443.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. vii. p. 109.

upon others. Jewel, we read, "was harboured, about three months, with Nicholas Culverwel, a citizen, living (unless I mistake, says Strype) in Thames-street: then, the Lord Williams of Thame, being sick, sent for him, and with him he abode some time<sup>3</sup>."

In the letter last alluded to, Jewel gives but a desponding account of the state of religion. The *Aposcopi*<sup>4</sup>, i. e. the Romish Bishops out of place, had not given way to the *Episcopi*, but were throwing every impediment to the furtherance of the Reformation. The Queen, nevertheless, was proceeding cautiously and wisely; not as Jewel saw then, but as we see now—and the great fact in the letter is, that she had appointed a Disputation to be held at Westminster, "with a view to the settlement of the main points in debate between the Romanists and the Reformers." This was to come off on the 1st of April; and on the 6th of that month Jewel writes an account of it to his friend at Zurich. Those who took part in it, and its results, are sufficiently well known, and need not be recorded here. The reader will find an excellent extract in Le Bas' Life, who, on the recorded wish of Jewel, that "once again (as the time would serve) there might be had a quiet and sober Disputation," makes these very pertinent remarks: "In expressing this opinion, Jewel must, surely, rather have consulted the candour and integrity of his own nature, than his knowledge of history, or his experience of mankind. For public disputations on religious matters have seldom been found to terminate in any thing but an aggravation of the embroilment."—We wish this may be borne in mind, both as regards the Papistic and Puritanic contest, whose dark forms are now looming in the offing<sup>5</sup>!

Jewel, meanwhile, kept up a constant correspondence with Peter Martyr, hoping and desponding alternately. On the whole, despite of massing, priests, and the little crucifix in the Queen's chapel, the Reformation proceeded.

The next material incident in his life was, his appointment to be a Commissioner in the general visitation of the dioceses, decided upon in the Parliament which ended the 8th of May, 1559. His commission bears date July 19th; and in his letter to Peter Martyr of the 1st of August, he speaks like one just setting out: "*Alterum jam pedem in terra habeo, alterum tunc sublatum in equum.*" His

<sup>3</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. i. pt. i. 192.

<sup>4</sup> See note by Dr. Jelf, vol. vii. p. 112. *Episcopi* is, however, used later in the same letter.

<sup>5</sup> "Unless we read amiss the signs of the times, that contest with the Church of Rome and with the Puritan, which has loomed in the offing these twenty years, is now taking a shape more definite, and day by day is drawing nigher and nigher." *Uncontroversial Preaching of the Parochial Clergy.* By JOHN WOOD WARTER, B.D. 1848.



destiny was to the West, through Reading, Abingdon, Gloucester, Bristol, Bath, Wells, Exeter, Cornwall, Dorset, and Salisbury: "and so it fell out very fitly," says Master Featley, "that he presented the first-born of these his labours in the Ministry, after his return, in Devonshire and parts adjacent, there first breaking the bread of life, where first he received the breath of life." It is in this letter that he speaks of the decided progress of the cause, though the Romanists, in their turn, were hoping that the present change *would not last an age*—as well as of the intent, on the Queen's part, of sending him as Bishop to Salisbury: "*Quod ego onus prorsus decrevi excutere.*" Speaking of himself, his words are, "*Ego minimus apostolorum.*" His having already preached at St. Paul's Cross, on the 18th of June, this year, was preparatory to his designation. On the 24th of that month, St. John Baptist's Day, the Latin Mass Book was abandoned, and the English Liturgy re-established.

"St. John the Baptist's Day,  
Put the Pope away."

Three months of patient travel were consumed on his journey as Commissioner, and on the 2nd of November he again writes to Peter Martyr, informing him of his return—" *tandem tamen aliquando Londinum redii, confecto molestissimo itinere, confecto corpore.*" When we consider the lameness of Jewel, and that this was neither the age of roads, coaches, nor rails, we may be sure he wrote feelingly. The letter in question<sup>6</sup> contains a most interesting account of his labours, and of his success. Jewel was, in fact, just the man to fulfil his office well; for, like Dan Chaucer's "pour Persone of a toun,"

"Christes love, and his apostels twelve,  
He taught, but first he folwed it himselve!"

But not only in the district apportioned out to him, but throughout the whole of England, the effect of this visitation was to forward the Reformation entirely. "And of the clergy," says Strype, "that is, bishops, abbotts, heads of colleges, prebendaries, and rectors, the commissioners brought in but one hundred and eighty-nine, throughout the whole nation, that refused compliance with the declaration which restored her Supremacy to the Queen, and admitted the Book of Divine Service to be according to the Word of God<sup>7</sup>." It is remarkable, by the way, in the letter above alluded to, that Harding, Jewel's after antagonist, declined

<sup>6</sup> See vol. viii. p. 128.

<sup>7</sup> See Strype's Annals, vol. i. p. 255. The form of subscription is also given, as he "found it in the MS. library at the Palace of Lambeth."

to acquiesce: "*Hardingus homo constans locum mutare maluit quam sententiam.*"

The matter which henceforward was the great impediment to peace, and so to the advancement of the Reformation, was, the question of habits and ceremonies—in short, the continuation of that dispute which had commenced at Frankfort. Into this controversy of pitiful scruples, unto which so much forbearance was long shown, we have no time to enter. Jewel, it is well known, like his friend Peter Martyr, was for some time more entangled in these cobwebs than might have been expected; and, with his abhorrence of the rags of Popery, he had communicated not only with him, but with Bullinger likewise. In his letter to Peter Martyr, dated 5th Nov. 1559, he thus expressed himself: "*Sunt quidem istæ, ut tu optimè scribis, reliquæ Amorrhæorum; quis enim id neget? Atque utinam aliquando ab imis radicibus auferri atque extirpari possint. Nostræ quidem nec vires ad eam rem, nec voces deerunt*<sup>8</sup>." Time however, and consideration, and experience, which teaches the teachable, taught Jewel the futility—not to say the imminent danger—of such controversies; and it is most satisfactory to read this under his own hand, in a letter to Archbishop Parker, wherein he speaks of the cap, and surplice, and tippet, and so forth, as "*this vain contention about apparel.*" The letter is dated from Sarum, 22nd Dec., 1565; and, curious enough, it had reference to the admission or refusal of his future biographer, Humphrey, to a benefice in his diocese. The turning point was Humphrey's well-known leaning to Puritanism, and with it to all vain disputations which at this time were rending the Church of England<sup>9</sup>.

In passing on, we will only remark how near we were, two or three years ago, to the revival of this melancholy dispute; and how little many seemed to have profited by the documentary history of the past which lay ready to their hands. The diocese of Exeter, it will be at once recollected, was in a ferment; and how near the diocese of Chichester was to the cauldron of confusion will not be forgotten. Such powerful agents are trivial disputes in disturbing public as well as private repose! Learned and judicious Hooker, best of counsellors, how many might take advice of thee! "What habit or attire doth beseem each order to use in the course of common life, both for the gravity of his place and for example's sake to other men, is a matter frivolous to be dis-

<sup>8</sup> Vol. viii. p. 134.

<sup>9</sup> The reader is referred for further and fuller information to Strype's Annals, vol. i. pt. i. p. 256, c. xiii.; to Burnet's History of the Reformation under v. Habits; to the authorities referred to by Keble on Hooker's Preface, c. ii.; to Churton's Life of Nowel, p. 113, &c.; and to the eminently just and wise views of the lamented Southey in his invaluable Book of the Church. Peter Martyr's views may be seen very well put by Mr. Le Bas' Life of Jewel, pp. 83. 85.

puted of. A small measure of wisdom may serve to teach them how they should cut their coats. But seeing all well-ordered politics have ever judged it meet and fit, by certain special distinct ornaments, to sever each sort of men from other when they are in public, to the end that all may receive such compliments of civil honour as are due to their rooms and callings, even when their persons are not known; it argueth a disproportioned mind in them whom so decent orders displease<sup>10</sup>."

But we must now turn to Jewel in a different capacity,—as a Bishop of the Church. On his return from his visitation, the See of Sarum was offered to him; and although he did not wish to undertake the burden, he was unwilling to disobey the commands of the Queen, and accordingly was consecrated by Archbishop Parker the 21st of January, 1560. Even so soon after as the 4th of February the burden sat heavily upon him; for he writes to Peter Martyr, saying, "*Nunc ardet lis illa circularia*," and presently adds, "*Eo jam res pervenit, ut aut cruces argenteæ et stanneæ, quas nos ubique confregimus, restituendæ sint, aut episcopatus relinquendi*<sup>1</sup>." By degrees, however, these fears and scruples died out, and we find him at his post. "And surely," says the abbreviator of Humphrey, "if ever to any, then unto him, his bishoprick was a continual work of ruling and governing, not only by the pastoral staff of his jurisdiction in his consistory, but also in the course of men's conscience, by the golden sceptre of God's Word preached. The memory of his assiduity in preaching, carefulness in providing pastors, resoluteness in reforming abuses, bounty in relieving the poor, wisdom in composing litigious strifes, equity in judging spiritual causes, faithfulness in keeping, and sincerity in bestowing church-goods,—is as an ointment poured out and blown abroad through the diocese of Sarum, by the breath of every man's commendation." Certainly, if at the first he held the crozier with an unwilling, or even a timid, hand, it grew firmer and well fitted to his grasp! And if he thought—

" A verdict in the jury's breast  
Will be given up anon at least,  
And then 'tis fit we hope the best<sup>2</sup>;"

he has the verdict of religious and good men in his favour. He did his duty and has his praise, notwithstanding evil days or evil tongues!

Those who succeeded to bishoprics now found them sadly impoverished. "Though the Church was replenished with Gospel Bishops, yet not," says Strype, "had any cause to envy their

<sup>10</sup> Eccl. Pol. Book v. lxxix. 13.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. viii. p. 139.

<sup>2</sup> Ford. Epilogue to the Lady's Trial.



wealth or greatness." Their Popish predecessors went upon the principle, of making hay whilst the sun shone, and so contrived to alienate all they could, *per fas et nefas*, for present benefit. Nay, more, said Strype's informant, these Marian prelates "had so leased out their houses, lands, and parks, that some of the new Bishops had scarce a corner of a house to lie in, and divers not so much ground as to graze a goose or a sheep, so that some were compelled to tether their horses in their orchard<sup>3</sup>." And this it was which gave occasion to the outcry amongst the poor of "parsimonious Protestants;" whereas, in truth, so little was left them to give, that they were constrained to live in the simplest manner, and few were enabled to steer clear of debt.

Pretty much in this state was the diocese of Sarum. Jewel's predecessor in this see was one hight John Capon,—as it happened, an unlucky name. He had died some three years before, but had so contrived matters as that scarce a good living was left sufficient to support a learned man, which gave occasion for Jewel to say, "*Capon hath devoured all!*" Hence "the good Bishop was forced all his lifetime after to take extraordinary pains in travelling and preaching in all parts of his diocese, which brought him to his grave the sooner." Happy Jewel! happy Wilson! Who so happy, says the author of Gondibert,

"As those whose bodies wait upon their minds?"

Would that many of our Bishops now were better acquainted with their dioceses! Would that those who have the *will* had the *power*! It would be the means of defending the cause of the poor; it would better the working of that most ill-regulated body—the Ecclesiastical Commission for England; it might hinder a new Commission, which, once constituted under existing feelings, would cut Episcopal revenues to the quick. In short, it would hinder some truthful and plain-spoken Latimer from saying, "Meseems, it were more comely for my lord (if it were comely for me to say so) to be a preacher himself, having so great a cure as he hath, than to be a disquieter and a troubler of preachers, and to preach nothing at all himself<sup>4</sup>." Who reads old Latimer's

<sup>3</sup> Annals, vol. ii. pt. i. p. 233. What follows reminds us of the documents said to exist in Ireland: "And yet had these fathers provided that, if they should have been restored (which they looked for, as many thought), they should have all their commodities again."

<sup>4</sup> Latimer to Sir Edward Baynton, Knight, Works, vol. ii. p. 328, Park. Society's ed. We cannot avoid this opportunity of paying a passing tribute to the late Archbishop of Canterbury. Who so ready of access? who so thoughtful for his Clergy?

We heard a story of a Bishop, not many years ago, who at his Triennial Visitation (the only time that some of his Clergy ever saw him) sipped and sipped, but was observed scarce to eat. The company soon broke up, and his lordship went to dine at the *great house*, hard by the provincial inn, where numbers had come from a

sermons, and does not see how much of them is applicable to the Episcopate even nowadays? Charles Borromeo set an example at Trent which may be acted up to in Protestant England! "May God all amend!" quoth the motto to Master Rudyng's arms, sometime Archdeacon of Lincoln<sup>5</sup>.

But to return to Jewel. It was in this year, March 31st, 1560, and on the second Sunday before Easter, that he delivered his celebrated sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23. The most celebrated of the exiles were naturally appointed to preach at Paul's Cross, and Jewel's name, of course, was amongst the chosen ones. The sermon in question had evidently attracted great attention, for it is to be borne in mind that (in a less expanded form probably) it had been twice delivered before,—Nov. 26, 1559, at St. Paul's Cross, March 17, 1560, at Court<sup>6</sup>. There can be little doubt, we think, but that its contents were expected, and that it was looked upon as THE CHALLENGE repeated. We have not space to insert the several articles protested against, but refer our readers to the sermon itself, giving only the conclusion:

"If any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these Articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, Doctors, or Councils, as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him and to subscribe. But I am well assured that they shall never be able truly to allege one sentence; and because I know it, therefore I speak it, lest ye haply should be deceived."—Vol. i. p. 32.

The letters which followed with Dr. Cole, whose character and history are well known, and the thoroughly weighed "Reply of the Bishop of Sarum," may be considered as introductory to the great controversies which followed. It was in this Reply that, on Dr. Cole's saying, "I see well ye write much and read little," Jewel acquainted him with the severe course of study he had pursued; "*and yet*," he adds, "*until this day I never set abroad in print twenty lines*"<sup>7</sup>. What he wrote afterwards fully exemplified the poet's words:—

great distance, from personal respect to THE OFFICE.—Such things should not be, or, if they be, the MAN loses all respect! We say, as Skelton said,

Of no good bishop speak I,  
Nor good priest of the cleargy—

\* \* \* \*

By my recountyng is  
Of them that do amiss

COLIN CLOUT.

<sup>5</sup> Letters from the Bodleian, vol. ii. p. 182.

<sup>6</sup> See note, vol. i. p. 3. By this arrangement Cole's expression in his letter of March 18th (p. 42), "in your sermon yesterday at Court," is explained.

<sup>7</sup> Vol. i. p. 86. In writing to Simler the next year, May 4, 1561, Jewel states

“No man can attayn perfect cunnyng,  
But by long study, and diligent learnynge.”

In September this year, a commission was issued by Archbishop Parker for the visitation of the cities and dioceses of Sarum and Bristol, dated September 8th. This was committed to Jewel; but the commission to visit the cathedral church of Sarum to Dr. John Cottrel, “that all occasion of contest between the Bishop and Dean and Chapter might be avoided.” The next year Jewel seems to have been pretty much in residence, and employed in his arduous and well-comprehended duties as a Bishop; though we find that on the 13th of April he was pitched upon to preach at St. Paul’s; and there is a letter of his to Simler, dated London, May 4th. “It was the wisdom,” says Strype, “of the present governors, to put up from time to time able, learned, discreet, and aged men to be teachers of the people at these solemn and great assemblies, who did commonly make it their business in their sermons to prove and evince the present proceedings in religion; and, as occasion served, to lay open the errors and corruptions of that religion and worship that was now lately rejected<sup>8</sup>.” In this same year we find a letter from Peter Martyr to him, dated Zurich, 15th August, on the subject of the Ubiquitarian controversy<sup>9</sup>; and it may be remarked in passing, —especially as the matter is again under debate, and many side with Pelican, Paullus, Fagius, and Lyra,—that he was likewise consulted on the subject of marriage with two sisters, which he expressed himself as opposed to. Bishop’s Jewel’s letter on the subject is extant, bearing date “From Sarum, Calend. Nov. 1561.” It evidently arose, as Dr. Jelf remarks, “out of the case of the Earl of Westmoreland, who had married two sisters successively.” For our own parts, without entering into particulars, we wish to state decidedly, that we agree with Jewel, and are not surprised to find that Elizabeth wrote to the Archbishop of York, expressing her astonishment that the Earl should be permitted to keep the sister of his former wife as his wife, such being contrary to the law of God<sup>1</sup>.

The ensuing year, 1562, might be called the “magnus annus” or “the climacteric” of Jewel’s life, for in it he published his well-known work, the “*Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*.” In his letter to

that he is no penman, “*Nos vero, qui ista non possumus*,” &c. How little, as Dr Jelf remarks, “did Jewel then think that he would have to conduct the most important controversy of his time!” Vol. viii. p. 152.

<sup>8</sup> Strype’s Annals, vol. i. pt. i. 369.

<sup>9</sup> On this question, then agitated in Germany, see Le Bas’ Remarks, p. 127, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Jelf gives this from a curious letter in the State Paper Office from the Queen. See vol. viii. p. 160, note.



Peter Martyr, February 7th, this year, are these words: *Edidimus nuper Apologiam de mutatâ religione et discessione ab ecclesiâ Romanâ. Eum ego librum, etsi dignus non est, qui mittatur tam procul, tamen ad te mitto.* Internal evidence fixes this letter to the *New Style*, and so fixes the year in which the Apology was published. This point is canvassed in the notes to the Editor's Preface, p. xiv.

It has been the fashion amongst a party to decry this most valuable work. Indeed, the works of the English Reformers have been spoken of as "literary curiosities," rather than "valuable contributions to our theology<sup>2</sup>." We need not say how utterly opposed we are to such sweeping assertions; and as to the publication itself, nothing could be better timed, nothing is even now more profitable. We have just risen from reading it, and the racy translation of it by the Lady Bacon, (very properly inserted in the eighth volume of this edition, because adopted generally as the text book for Harding's Confutation, and Bishop Jewel's Defence,) with increased delight. To the young theological student, we say, LEGAT, RELEGAT. Yea, with Lawrence Humphrey, we could wish it—in the place of sundry unclassical works,—OMNIBUS SCHOLIS CHRISTIANÆ JUVENTUTI AD EDISCENDUM PROPONI. Were it duly and rightly studied, we should have fewer *amateurs* of Popery;—we can apply no worthier appellation to sundry *λιποτάξεις* of modern days! To the Jesuit, Protestant, or other, we offer the well-known lines in Wallenstein, for his consideration:

“Nicht hoffe, wer des Drachen Zähne sä't  
Erfreuliches zu ärnten. Jede Unthat  
Trägt ihren eignen Rache-Engel schon,  
Die Böse Hoffnung, unter ihrem Herten!”

Tom, i. vii.

But we are not called to do what has been done, and done well, by countless others—that is, to make an *Apologia Apologiæ*. Suffice it to say, that although it be not an authorized book, yet, in a sense, it is authorized by the Church of England; for, in Elizabeth's days, together with Fox's Book of Martyrs, and the Holy Bible, "it was enjoined to be set up in some convenient place in all parish churches, to be read at all suitable times by the people, before or after Service<sup>3</sup>." The general reader, provided he be a scholar, will admire the elegance of the Latinity,—the divine, the soundness of the position it maintains. The cry is still raised, as it was when Jewel wrote, "Nos ab Ecclesiâ Catholicâ tumultuosè defecisse, et nefario schismate orbem terrarum concussisse, et

<sup>2</sup> Brit. Critic, ut supra, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. iii. pt. i. p. 738.

pacem communem atque otium Ecclesiæ publicum conturbasse ;” the answer he makes, is our answer too. In the Bishop of St. Asaph's words, who, it is clear from his Sketch, &c., is not bitterly opposed either to Papist or Puritan,—in some points is almost their apologist :—He there states, in a brief and oratorical style, the grounds of the separation of our Church from that of Rome ; showing that, in what she had done, England had rather returned to the state of the Primitive Church, than occasioned a schism in the Christian family, and that the innovation with which we were charged was merely the rejection of the errors introduced by the community from which we had separated.” (VIII. § 411.) Of its publication into sundry other tongues, Jewel himself speaks in his Preface to the Defence of the Apology, or rather in an Epistle to Queen Elizabeth<sup>4</sup>, prefixed to it. And few books probably have been wider circulated. No wonder that Bullinger, and Gualter, and Wolf thought so highly of it on the Continent—no wonder that Peter Martyr, some three months before his death, should thus write :—“ *Ego verum plurimum lætor, quod illum diem viderim, quo factus sis parens tam illustris et elegantis filii.*” These words were written circa August, 1562. On the 12th of the November following, he died.

In concluding our remarks on this celebrated work, we may subjoin the words of Jewel himself, from the Defence of the Apology, Part i. c. 4. Divis. 2. “It was read,” says he to Harding, “and sharply considered, in your late convent at Trident, and great threats made there that it should be answered, and the matter by two notable learned Bishops taken in hand, the one a Spaniard, and the other an Italian : which two, notwithstanding, these five whole years, have yet done nothing, nor, I believe, intend anything to do. Indeed, certain of your brethren have been often gnawing at it : but such as care nothing, nor is cared, what they write.” As Master Featley says, “they are now not to answer the ‘Apologie,’ but to apologize for their politick not answering it !”

On the question of the Second Book of our Homilies, we have not space to enter ; nor on the controverted dates, ranging from 1560 to 1563. We refer our readers to Bishop Short's valuable note (VIII. § 412) ; giving, at the same time, the extract following, from Hey's Lectures on Article XXXV. : “Our *Second Book* of Homilies, the titles of which are mentioned in our Article, was published early in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, in 1560. They had been prepared, or nearly so, before the death of King Edward ; and they seem to be, in a manner, promised in his injunctions.—They were composed, in a good measure, by Bishop Jewel, author

<sup>4</sup> See vol. viii. p. 170. This letter is usually prefixed to the Apologia.

of the famous 'Apology for the Reformation.' Since Dr. Cardwell published Richard Taverner's Postils, two of them—the first Homily on the Passion, and that on the Resurrection, have found their right owner. These Postils, by the way, are a very remarkable composition. They were compiled and published in the year 1540.

We must not omit to state, that Dr. Jelf refers the celebrated Letter of Jewel to Seignor Scipio—supposed by the late Dr. Wordsworth to be Scipione Biondi, the son of Michel-Angiolo Biondi<sup>5</sup>—to this same year; and the internal evidence he points out is in favour of the supposition. It appears first in Brent's translation of Father Paul's "History of the Council of Trent;"—and, as we remarked before, Dr. Jelf concludes it to be, if an unfinished, yet a genuine work of Jewel. The drift of the letter is probably known to most of our readers:—those who may wish to refresh their memories, are referred to Fuller's Church History (Book ix. Cent. xvi.), where they will find "the sum of Mr. Jewel's answer" set down. That Jewel contemplated an answer, as to why we did not send representatives to Trent, we collect from his letter to Peter Martyr, dated 7th of February, this same year. The words are these: "*Nos nunc cogitamus publicare causas, quibus inducti ad concilium non veniamus. Ego quidem sic statuo et sentio, istis congressionibus et colloquiis nihil posse promoveri hoc tempore, nec Deum velle uti istis mediis ad propagandum evangelium.*" The proceedings of this Cabal had caused Jewel to alter his opinions, expressed some years before.

Of Jewel's labours in the year 1563, we have scarcely any record at all; but we know well enough that every day brought its appointed task; and his position was now such as to render him a counsellor upon all occasions. One date assigned would lead us to suppose that he was engaged upon the second Book of Homilies. Three letters only are given in the present edition for 1563—so memorable for the termination of the Council of Trent. One of them is to Bullinger,—the other two to Josias Simler, the successor of Peter Martyr in the theological chair at Zurich. In the former of these, in which reference is made to the Ubiquitarian Controversy before alluded to, occurs one of those painful passages, so properly referred to by Dr. Jelf, in his note, Vol. vi. p. 233, in which he hints, quoting the 22nd Book of Sleidam's History, that "unscrupulous and shocking pleasantries of this kind seems to have been the fashion of the day." Expressions such as these, are the only excuse for the no less intemperate remark of the late Mr. Froude,—as he ever appeared to us a very hasty,

<sup>5</sup> Eccl. Biog. iii. p. 308. See Dr. Jelf's note, vol. viii. p. 73



a very weak and ill-judging young man: "As to the Reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewel was what you would, in these days, call an irreverent Dissenter. His defence of his Apology disgusted me more than almost any work I ever read<sup>6</sup>." How entirely wise are that noble poet's words:

"Farre more delightful than they fruitful be,  
Witty apparence, guile that is beguill'd;  
Corrupting minds, much rather than directing  
The allay of duty, and our prides erecting<sup>7</sup>!"

Of the two letters to Simler, one is a playful one, and the other has reference to his departed friend Peter Martyr, in which he acknowledged the receipt of an image of him wrought in silver, and encourages the Professor to proceed in editing his Commentaries on Genesis, which Jewel had not seen, and a complete collection of his works. Strype<sup>8</sup> states that, on the present occasion, these Commentaries accompanied Simler's oration of Martyr's Life. If so, it must have been in MS. (which is unlikely), as Jewel's words are,—"*tamen non dubito esse ejusmodi, ut, si EDANTUR, videri possint Petri Martyris.*" We must refer our readers to the original letter for the affecting words relative to what he missed in the *Effigies*, and must not omit to state that Peter Martyr had dedicated to Jewel his treatise *De utraque in Christo Naturâ*, as may be seen in his Letter to him, August 15, 1561.

But, although the particulars relative to Jewel himself for this year are few and scant, it is remarkable for Harding's "*Answer to M. Juelles Challenge.*" For four years it had grated upon the Romanists; and, at last, Harding was put forth as their champion. Of others, and minor antagonists, we have no space to speak; and we refer our readers to Churton's 6th Section of the Life of Nowel, where they will find the information they may want. Of Harding, however, we must speak a word; "for this is that Master Harding," says Dr. Overal, in the Preface to the folio edition<sup>9</sup>, following the words of Humphrey, "which, in the days of King Edward, publicly and frequently preached in defiance of our religion; and so earnestly in opposition against Popery, and particularly the paper walls and painted fires of Purgatory,

<sup>6</sup> Froude's Remains, vol. i. pt. i. p. 379.

<sup>7</sup> Lord Brooke, Of Human Learning.

<sup>8</sup> See Annals, vol. i. pt. i. p. 430.

<sup>9</sup> See Fuller's Abel Redivivus, p. 313. He informs us that Dr. Overal wrote the Preface, and that the Appendix was by Bishop Morton. Godwin, de Presulibus Angliæ, says of Harding, "Non defuit tamen Dares qui hunc Entellum provocaret, *Hardingus quidam*," p. 354. He appears to have borrowed the expression from Jewel himself. It occurs in a letter to Bullinger, vol. viii. p. 186.

that he wished his voice had been equal to the great bell of Osney<sup>1</sup>, that he might ring in the dull ears of the deaf Papists." The annexed rapid sketch of his life is in the words of Mr. Le Bas.

"Thomas Harding, like Jewel, was a Devonshire man. He was born at Comb-Martin, in 1512. His earliest education was at Barnstaple. From thence he was removed to Winchester, and afterwards to New College, Oxford; of which he became a Fellow in 1536. In 1542 he was appointed by Henry VIII. to the Hebrew Professorship. His religious notions or professions must therefore have, at least, kept pace with the proceedings of the King. When Edward came to the throne, however, his Protestantism assumed a much more decided aspect. In time, he was appointed chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk, father of Lady Jane Grey; and had the honour of instructing that ill-fated lady in the doctrines of the Reformation. The accession of Queen Mary in a moment reconverted him to Popery; and the chaplain of the Lady Jane now became the chaplain and confessor to Bishop Gardiner! His prompt *repentance* was rewarded, first, by a stall at Westminster, and next, by the Treasurership of the cathedral of Salisbury<sup>2</sup>. The death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth were fatal to his preferments, but effected no change in his last religious profession. When the Romish cause became desperate in England, he retired to Louvain in Flanders, where his time was chiefly employed in his controversy with Bishop Jewel, and where he died in the year 1572."—p. 139.

As it will not accord with our limits to speak particularly of Harding, we may here remark, that the very fact of his being pitched upon as the one most fitting to be answered by Jewel, shows that he was the doughtiest antagonist of the Roman band. Even Humphrey, whose philippic is so trenchant, admits, *In multis pares sunt, et ambo doctrinæ et eloquentiæ gloriâ præcël-lentes*. Ourselves certainly do not think that they were *in multis pares*; but the powers of Harding must have been very considerable, or Leland the Antiquary would hardly have spoken of him in the way he did in his *Cyanea Cantio* and in his *Encomia*. In the first he says,

"Cultor præterea sacræ loquelæ  
Hardingus numerum politus auget<sup>3</sup>;"

and in the latter, addressed *Ad Tho. Hardingum Theologum*—in somewhat rhetorical style, he compared his eloquence to that of Cicero and Demosthenes. Of course, it is not meant to press

<sup>1</sup> Jewel himself refers to this story in the Defence of the Apology, pt. v. c. vi. div. 1. vol. vi. p. 83. He there calls it "the bell of Frideswide" or "Frideswide."

<sup>2</sup> We lighted upon the following in Leland's Itinerary, a few days back. "Hardingus primus *Thesaurarius* Eccles. Sarum!" fol. 65. vol. iii. p. 80. ed. 1744.

<sup>3</sup> Itinerary, vol. ix. ut supra, vv. 639, 640. The *Encom.* is in the *Collectanea*, vol. v. 136.

such eulogistic strains beyond the mark, but the bare fact shows that his literary capacities must have been great. As the Collectedanea are not in every one's hands, we transcribe the commencing lines:—

“Talis nuper erat tua certè oratio felix,  
Excoluit linguæ quæ decus omne sacræ,  
Qualis erat magni Demosthenis optima quondam,  
Atticus effluxit ejus ex ore lepos.  
Qualis et eximii Ciceronis floruit illa,  
Qua duce securus constitit ipse Milo!” &c. &c.

Thus much we thought it right to say of the man whom Wood calls in the *Athenæ Oxon.* “the target of Popery, and a zealous asserter of his religion.”

But, whatever may have been the powers of Harding, his powers of abuse and his coarseness seem to have superseded his better capacities; and no friend to Jewel's memory says, that “as far as language goes, he is even mild in comparison with his Roman antagonist<sup>4</sup>.” And not only so, but *Ἀμέραι ἐπίλοιποι μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι*, declare the ascendancy of Jewel in all and every argument he uses; his collections for his great controversial works being, it is to be noted, the result of his own industry, and, even at such a time, unprecedented reading; whereas, the replies of Harding, it seems pretty clear, as was intimated over and over again by Jewel, were the combined efforts of his College and of his Church. After-days, likewise, have ascertained that his authorities are often second-hand. This was noted by Churton in his *Life of Nowel*, and is now confirmed by Dr. Jelf. We give his own words, as we have above given all the credit to Harding which is his due: “Harding's style is wearisome and affected; his reasoning often ridiculously illogical, and most of his authorities borrowed at second hand: much of his work, as has been correctly remarked by Archdeacon Churton, in his *Life of Dean Nowel*, being a literal translation of Hosius<sup>5</sup>.” For an account of Jewel's writings, and particularly the controversy with Harding, the reader is referred to the plain and straightforward account of Mr. Le Bas, in the ninth chapter of his work, in which he says, we believe justly, “I am unable to recollect a single passage in which he disgraces himself by an imitation of his enemy” (p. 248). We will only observe, in conclusion, that Mr. Hallam, in his “*Literature of Europe*”<sup>6</sup>, gives no opinion on these controversies, stating that he is not competent; for ourselves, we have given the opinion of those whom we judge to be so.

<sup>4</sup> *British Critic*, ut supra.

<sup>5</sup> *Editor's Preface*, p. xxi. note.

<sup>6</sup> See vol. ii. p. 118.



For the year 1564, we have scarce any data at all. Jewel's Letter to Sir William Cecil, dated "*From my poor house in Sarum, 30 Januarii*,"—internal evidence gives to the next year. From the Table we gave at the commencement, it will be seen that the Translation of the Apology by that "learned and virtuous lady"—the Lady Anne Bacon—is assigned to 1564. Nothing can be more striking than the compliment paid her by Archbishop Parker; the more so, if, as Stype asserts, he had a great hand in the first, which came out in 1562. His words are these: "And now to the end both to acknowledge my good approbation, and to spread the benefit more largely, where your ladyship hath sent me your book written, I have with most hearty thanks returned it to you (as you see) printed; knowing that I have herein done the best, and in this point used a reasonable polity; that is, to prevent such excuses as your modesty would have made in stay of publishing it." Jewel, in adopting it, paid a like tribute to its "worth and hers." Like Margaret, the daughter of Sir Thomas More, and like Mrs. Godolphin, a century later, she must have been a most intelligent creature, and one worthy to be the mother of the great Lord Bacon. Reader! "because the heavens such grace did lend her<sup>7</sup>," thou wilt be well pleased to break a dull continuity with these exquisite stanzas from Davenant's Gondibert:

"The court (where single patterns are disgraced;  
Where glorious vice weak eyes admire;  
And virtue's plainness is by art outfaced,  
She makes a temple by her vestal fire.

"Though there, vice sweetly dress'd, does tempt like bliss  
Even cautious saints; and single virtue seem  
Fantastick, where brave vice in fashion is;—  
Yet she has brought plain virtue in esteem<sup>8</sup>."

On the 30th of January, 1565, as hinted at above, Jewel wrote to Cecil, from Salisbury, most heartily desiring that he might not be called "to preach this Lent before the Queen's Majesty," stating, as a reason, that many were looking for his book greedily, and some wondered it was not abroad long sithence, and that if he

<sup>7</sup> We do not mean to compare the intellectual capacity of Mrs. Godolphin either with that of the Lady Anne Bacon, or with that of the saint-like Mrs. Roper, the married name of More's "dear MEG," as he styles her, whose praises Erasmus and Stapleton could not sufficiently enunciate. But of Mrs. Godolphin, "a virtuous woman, mild and beautiful," we can most truthfully say,

"Holy, fair, and wise is she;  
The heavens such grace did lend her,  
That she might admired be."

*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, iv. 2.

<sup>8</sup> Book iii. canto v.

were obliged to present himself, it would be unto him a great loss of time, and a great hindrance unto the matter, and so a great encouraging unto the adversary<sup>9</sup>. The book alluded to was the "*Replie to Harding's Answere*," which appeared in August<sup>1</sup>; but, from the letter to Cecil, it is evident that either the MS. or the earlier sheets had been shown previously. Why or wherefore Jewel's request was not acceded to is not known; but we find from Strype, that he was called upon to preach, and in May we find him at Paul's Cross. Upon this occasion, he took upon him to make some observations upon some authorities in Harding's Book; "wherein were alleged, with much vaunt, spurious authors; and among the rest, Amphilochius, which author Jewel said in that audience,"—(he asserts the same in the *Replie*, vol. i. p. 314,)—that he had bound up in an old parchment book, with St. Thomas, the Popish martyr. He mentioned also, it seems, out of that book, with some sport,—(we may suppose after Latimer's manner)—a tale of angels' singing prick-song to St. Basil's mass, &c. &c.<sup>2</sup> The result of this was an angry letter from Harding, "to Maister John Juell," from Antwerp, dated 12th June, demanding the whole sermon, as yourself will stand to it, together with a Post-script "To the Reader," in which he is informed that "Mr. Juell's Replie is begonne to be in print," warning him at the same time of what "maner of pelfe must be the stuffing of his huge work now in the presse." The reader will hardly need to be informed that henceforth Amphilochius, and other authorities of Harding, equally authentic, became a sort of by-word. In a letter of the next year to Bullinger, he speaks of him as a "*vilis apostata—qui me ex Amphilochiis, Abdiis, Hippolytis, Clementibus, Victoribus, Athanasiiis suppositiciis, Leontis, Cletis, Anacletis, Epistolis Drecketalibus, somniis, fabulis, refutaret*:"—where, by the way, Dr. Jelf suggests that *Drecketalibus*<sup>3</sup> is a play on the word *Decretalibus*, *Dreck* in German signifying filth. Possibly our word *dredge* and *dredging-net* may be as near kinsmen to it as to the usual acceptation of *drag*.

It was in this same year that Harding's Confutation of a Book

<sup>9</sup> Vol. viii. p. 181.

<sup>1</sup> The Preface "unto the Christian Reader" is dated from London, the 6th of August, 1565, so that Jewel must have been in London twice this year, unless we suppose he remained there from May to August.

<sup>2</sup> See Annals, vol. i. pt. ii. p. 176. Harding's Letter, presently referred to, is printed at length in the Appendix, No. xxx. On the term "prick-song," see Nare's Gloss. in v. Aubrey tells us, by the way, in his Life of Hobbes, that "he had always bookes of *prick-song* lying on his table," &c., and that "he did believe it did his lungs good, and conduced much to prolong his life."—Letters from the Bodleian, ii. p. 623.

<sup>3</sup> "*Hoc est stercoreis*." Strype, in margin, Annals, vol. i. pt. ii. 543.

entitled "An Apologie of the Church of England," was put forth by him. This is alluded to by Jewel in his letter to Bullinger, just now cited; and from this time, notwithstanding his care for his diocese, which will be referred to by and by, we must look upon him as plunged still deeper in the vortex of controversy. "*Vix dum absolveram*"—he means his "Replie"—"*evolat extemplo Apologie nostræ Confutatio. Hic ego rursum petor,*" &c., to which he presently adds, "*Hæc idcirco visum est scribere prolixius, ut, si post-hac literæ istuc à me infrequentius venerint, quam aut vos expectatis, aut ego velim, id cuius potius rei, quam aut oblivioni vestri, aut ingratitude tribuatis*."

On reference to the Fasti Oxonienses, it will be seen that Harpsfield, Harding, and Cole were admitted Doctors of Divinity in 1554. From the same authority we learn, that on May 26, 1565, "it was granted by the Venerable Congregation that JOHN JEWEL, bishop of Salisbury, should, tho' absent, be actually created doc. of div. by a certain graduate to be assigned by the commissary. This was accordingly done at London, but the day when, appears not." Master Featley notes that "he was solemnly created Doctor, and bare the part of a Moderator in those famous acts, concluding with a divine speech, of our then, and now more truly to be called *Urania, Elizabeth*,"—all from Humphrey.—We are afraid Miss Strickland and these writers would be much at issue.

The letter to Archbishop Parker, relative to the "vain contention" about the habits, has been referred to before. It is dated 22 Dec. 1565. Though we know a good deal both of Sampson and Humphrey, it is curious that we do not know the result of this debate, except by implication. Jewel, with his own *private* scruples, attested in a letter written to Bullinger not two months afterwards, continued firm, for the peace of the Church; and, as it appears, declined instituting him. "Eventually"—we use the words of Mr. Soames—"Cecil procured him the deanery of Gloucester, strongly advising his conformity. Humphrey's eye was now cooled by riper age, and it could rest complacently even upon a vesture approved at Rome. He listened accordingly to Cecil's advice, and wore, all his latter years, at least while resident as Dean, the very dress that he had long denounced as an intolerant remnant of exploded superstition." How affecting is it to find, that even all that had occurred marred not the friendship of Jewel and Humphrey! That he was sent for by the Archbishop to preach his funeral sermon when he died; "but,

<sup>4</sup> Sarisberiae, viii. Febr. 1566, vol. viii. p. 186.

<sup>5</sup> Elizabethan Religious History, p. 56.



this being a plague year, Humphrey was removed from the University, so that the messenger that came to Oxford could not find him to deliver the message<sup>6</sup>! That he was pitched upon by the Archbishop and by the Bishop of London to write his life! That this HUMPHREY IS JEWEL'S FIRST AND EARLIEST BIOGRAPHER! What better illustration of the sacred text,—“*Many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it: if a man would give all the substance of his house for love, it would utterly be condemned*”<sup>7</sup>?

A matter is alluded to in the letter to Archbishop Parker which we must not omit to refer to,—we mean the destitution of the parochial pulpits. To obviate this evil, the archbishop had granted licences to certain preachers to preach throughout the kingdom. But those appointed swerved from their duties, and deceived the expectations of those who appointed them. “They went up and down,” says Strype, “preaching where they pleased in any church; and the curates allowed them, fearing to gainsay their licences<sup>8</sup>.” Such was the origin of the words which follow: “Certain, having obtained your Grace’s licence, pass up and down the country from church to church, preaching every where as if they were apostles, and, by virtue of your Grace’s seal, require money for their labours. I will stay one or other of them if I can, that your Grace may know him better.” The evil wrought its own cure, and the licences were eventually reversed. No doubt the adage *necessitas nullas habet leges* was acted upon, but, as it turned out, unluckily; for the evils resulting from such a course were precisely similar to those which put down the Mendicant Friars. The readers of Piers Ploughman, of Skelton’s<sup>9</sup> poems, and of old Latimer’s Sermons will not need catechising in what these evils were. In referring to Latimer, by the by, we may not omit

<sup>6</sup> Strype’s Parker, vol. ii. p. 49, 50.

<sup>7</sup> Canticles, ch. viii. ver. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Strype’s Parker, vol. i. p. 376, &c.

<sup>9</sup> The story of “John and the Ten Commandments,” in Latimer, is known to every one. Amongst other staves, Skelton sings thus:

“Many a fryar, God wot,  
Preaches for his grote,  
Flatteryng for a new cote,  
And for to have his fees,—  
Some for to gather cheese.  
Lothe they are to leve  
Either corne or malte:  
Sometime meale and sault,  
Sometime a bacon flicke,  
That is three fingers thycke,  
Of larde and grese,  
Their covent to encrease.”

COLIN CLOUT.

to state, that the idle and thoughtless amongst the clergy contrived to turn these Friars to account. "Also vicars and parsons," quoth he, in the sixth sermon on the Lord's Prayer, "be afraid when there cometh a sickness in the town; therefore they were wont commonly to get themselves out of the way, and send a friar thither, which did nothing else but lop and spoil them." Who can ever forget the words which were uttered by the time-honoured Wicklif—with countenance so beautiful—when, raising his attenuated form on the bed, he exclaimed, "I shall not die, but again declare the evil deeds of the Friars?" No improper application of Scripture was there here; but words they were of one, righteously applied, which will be remembered as long as mortal words may<sup>1</sup>!

"For thoughe his bodye be dead and mortall,  
His fame shall endure, and be memoriall<sup>2</sup>."

During the year 1566, it does not appear that Jewel published any thing; but it may be noted that Harding's "Rejoindre to Mr. Jewel's Replie" is dated the 31st of August. From this time, in fact, to his death, the data, by way of annals, are few and scanty. Of the two letters which refer to 1566, one has been quoted before, and the other likewise addressed to Bullinger. It may be here added, that in the first of these Jewel speaks of the severities of the preceding winter, and the scarceness of corn in consequence; and that it was three years now since he had set eyes on his friends Parkhurst, Sandys, and Pilkington—*ita procul disjecti sumus*. He next adverts to the affairs of Scotland, France, Denmark, and Sweden, and then thanks Bullinger for his Commentary on Daniel, and Lavater for his on Joshua, conveying at the same time to them the sum of twenty crowns, his annual pension to Julius, the attendant of his never-to-be-forgotten friend Peter Martyr, and twenty crowns more to Bullinger and Lavater—*ut eos vel in cœnam publicam pro more vestro, vel in quemvis alium usum pro vestro arbitrio consumatis*.—Such was the freedom of those days; such the intercourse of Jewel with those he loved.

The other letter above referred to, written hardly more than a month after, shows how Jewel was engaged,—that is to say, in preparation of the Defence of the Apology. With reference to certain points, he there puts these questions to Bullinger, appealing to him remarkably—"Tu enim solus jam superes, unicum prope

<sup>1</sup> See the Life of Wicklif, by Mr. Le Bas, p. 196. Of this Life also we must speak as we have done of the Life of Jewel. In these days they are good for "all men's hands." Of the History of the Mendicants, and of their introduction into England, 1221, he treats in the third chapter.

<sup>2</sup> Hawes's Past. of Pleasure.

*oraculum Ecclesiarum.*" 1. Whether the Christians in Greece, Asia, Syria, and Armenia used private Masses, as the Papists did; and what kind of Masses, whether public or private, the Greeks at Venice then used. 2. Whereas there was one Camotensis, who had writ somewhat sharply against the lives and insolence of the Popes; who he was, and where he lived. 3. What he thought of the German Council, which they say met under Charles the Great, against the second Nicene Council, concerning images; because some said there was no such Council<sup>3</sup>.—Our particular object in quoting these queries is, because of the word "*Camotensis*," which was fastened upon by Harding. Jewel quotes the word as he found it in Cornelius Agrippa. The real author is now well known to have been Joannes Sarisburiensis, sometimes called *Carnotensis*, from his see of *Chartres*. It may be satisfactory to the reader to refer to Dr. Jelf's note, which he will find in vol. ii. p. 217, and to what Jewel himself says in "A Preface to the Reader," vol. iv. p. 119. The question of the Eastern Church is dealt with in the Defence, Part v. chap. 15, div. 1, vol. vi. p. 183, &c.; that of the Council, held at Frankfort, A.D. 794, in Part vi. chap. 17, div. 1 and 2, vol. xi. p. 463, &c. No reply from Bullinger is extant; but, in a letter to him the year following, Jewel thanks him for his very learned and lengthened reply. This letter of Bullinger's may yet be found.

The year 1567, in which "Another Rejoindre to Mr. Jewel's Replie against the Sacrifice of the Mass" appeared, is notorious as the year in which Jewel's Defence of the Apology was published,—that book which drove Harding and the Papists to desperation,—which from that day to this (unpleasant as is the tone of controversy) has been the storehouse of authorities to be wielded against the pretensions of the Seven Hills—the Pope in conclave—abetted by his Cardinals, or standing alone in his all-sufficiency. We wish not our youths to be given up to disputation, but prepared they must be, if they are to hold their position as divines; and therefore do we call upon them to consider well the points on which the contest with the Church of Rome turns. As a help, and a great one, Jewel is never to be passed by; Barrow, also, on the Supremacy, should be at their right hand.

The letter from Jewel to Bullinger, dated 24th February, this year, alludes to his constant occupation on the Defence. "*Lovanienses nostri turbant, et clamant, quantum possunt, et habent fautores, non ita multos, plures tamen multo quam velim*;" to which he adds, that, as ill luck would have it, all their attacks made him their butt. The same letter contains reference to Eliza-

<sup>3</sup> This is from Strype. See Letter, vol. viii. p. 183.



beth's unwillingness to name her "successor<sup>4</sup>," and to the fearful tragedy in Scotland. The death of his much-regarded Julius, he says, has been reported to him; but he sends the annual pension nevertheless, with a request that, if he be no more, it should be expended in *epulum scholasticum*. The softened style in which he speaks of the question of the habits shows how his opinions on this head had become modified. The words are so striking, that we subjoin the original: "*De religione, causa illa vestitaria magnos hoc tempore motus concitavit. Reginam, certum est, nolle flecti. Fratres autem nostri quidam ita eâ de re pugnant, ac si in eâ omnis nostra religio versaretur. Itaque functiones abjicere—*(we must not forget that this too was once Jewel's own resolution)—*et ecclesias inanes relinquere malunt, quam tantillum de sententiâ decedere. Neque aut tuis, aut D. Gualteri doctissimis scriptis, aut aliorum piorum virorum monitis moveri volunt*<sup>5</sup>." It is with individuals as with improveable lands, provided proper culture be used.

"Multa dies, variusque labor mutabilis ævi  
Rettulit in melius!"

The letter to Cecil relative to the letter to the Queen,—“An Epistle to Queen Elizabeth,”—is dated September 27, 1567. The Preface to the Defence, October 17, 1567. It may be well to quote these words near the conclusion:—“It may please your Majesty graciously to weigh it, and to judge of it, not according to the skill and ability of the writer, but according to the weight and worthiness of the cause. The poor labours have been mine; the cause is God's. The goodness of the one will be always able to countervail the simplicity of the other.”—Vol. iv. p. 105.

Reserving our remarks upon his episcopal and ministerial labours for the present, we follow Jewel according to his correspondence, from which we learn, that at the commencement of 1568 he was entering into the visitation of his diocese. This drops out accidentally in the first of his four letters to Archbishop Parker. This no less faithful than munificent Prelate,—the friend of learning and of learned men,—had this year, by a commission dated July 7th, received authority from the Council for searching after antiquities. From Jewel's letter, *Sarum*, 18 January, in which he thanks his Grace for “his great gentleness,” and tells him likewise “that he had ransacked the poor library of Salisburie,” but that he “had found nothing worth finding, saving only one book in the Saxon tongue,”—it is clear that Parker was occupied

<sup>4</sup> The same thing is hinted at in Lord Buckhurst's Gorboduc,—or, as it is sometimes yet called, *Ferrex and Porrex*. Southey has somewhere noted this.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. viii. p. 191.

in his search previous to the grant of the Commission. What literature and theology owe to his exertions, this is not the place to dwell upon; but neither Protestant nor Romanist will forget the publication of Elfric's famous Paschal Homily, which speaks things "plainly and evidently contrary to the novel doctrine of the Papal Transubstantiation." The extract following, from Strype, which calls to our minds the

"Virtus Scipiadæ et mitis sapientia Læli,"

we cannot prevail upon ourselves to omit: "The spare hours of his old age (which was pleasant and cheerful) he spent in searching into ancient authors, then not come to light, and in comparing the opinions of the modern Doctors with the opinions of the ancients. And especially he inquired into our British and Saxon monuments, which treated of this Church of Britain, whereby he saw evidently how much this our Church, by the encroachments of the Papacy, had deviated from its ancient doctrines and practices<sup>6</sup>."

The book found and forwarded by Jewel turned out to be Pope Gregory the Great's Tract, *De Curâ Pastoralis*, turned paraphrastically into Saxon by King Alfred; also that King's Preface, with a poem, wherein the book speaks to the reader; turned out of Saxon into Latin by some modern person, supposed to be William Lamburd. The two letters here referred to are at the end of the volume in the public library, Cambridge.

Two more letters to Archbishop Parker relate to other matters, now without so much interest. He incidentally mentions again the ordering of ministers by M. Lancaster<sup>7</sup>, "now Elect of Armagh," adding that one had been admitted, whom, "for many good and just causes," Jewel had for eight years refused. In both letters, he refers to the purpose, by the printers, of again putting forth his Latin Apology, and he intreats the Archbishop to stop the publication till better revised. To errors and mistakes, he says, "these printers have small regard, as tendering only their private gain." 26 April, and again 7 Maii, 1568: "I am afraid of

<sup>6</sup> See Strype's Parker, vol. ii. p. 455. The account of the Saxon Homily is in vol. i. p. 472, &c. On this see Soame's Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church; and, for a just estimate of Parker's labours, his Elizabethan Religious History.

<sup>7</sup> "On account of the poverty of the see of Armagh," says Bp. Mant in his History of the Church of Ireland, "Thomas Lancaster, who succeeded to the primacy, on which occasion he preached his own consecration sermon, had a licence, a few days after his consecration, to hold in *commendam* several benefices both in England and Ireland, which at the time of his advancement he possessed, and to retain them during such time as he should continue primate; but under a proviso, that the said churches should not be defrauded of their usual service, but be supplied with a provision of vicars and curates."—Vol. i. p. 282. This passage is referred to in Dr. Jelf's note. Happily things are not quite so bad now!

printers. Their tyranny is terrible!" All readers of our old Divines must be well aware, that these worthies did then print and spell as it seemed good in their own eyes! Of the three other letters to Cecil, from the original MS. in the State Paper Office, we have no information, so as to throw light upon them, at hand. They relate to certain poor Greeks and their books, whom Jewel wished to serve. One of them, Nicolas de la Turre, he mentions by name; and their books, it appears, were purchased.

We must not omit to mention that it was in 1568 that Harding published his "Detection of Sundry foul Errors uttered by Mr. Jewel, in his Defence of the Apology."

The year 1569 drew from Jewel the second and enlarged Edition of the "Defence," exposing also the "Detection." This came out in December, and with it the controversy may be said to have ended. The date is, (vol. iv. p. 131,) "*From Salisbury, 11th Decemb. 1569.*" Dr. Jelf informs us that the Defence of the Apology, in these volumes, has been collated with the Edition of 1570 "imprinted by Henry Wyke," which contained the last correction of the Author.

In the present Edition will be seen likewise a letter of Bishop Jewel, found in his study "certain months after his forsaking his earthly dwelling," and sent to John Garbrand, to whom he bequeathed all his papers and note books, dated 20th August, 1569. It relates to the subject of "*usury*," on which Jewel, like many of our elder Divines, held very rigid opinions. His views may be seen by the reader in his Exposition upon the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, ch. iv. ver. 6. (vol. vii. p. 63, &c.), which appears to have been delivered this year, in a Series of Discourses in his own Cathedral. This and other posthumous works, were published by the above-named J. Garbrand in 1582 and 1583. Not only this Exposition, but the Treatise of the Sacraments (vol. viii.), and the Treatise of the Holy Scriptures (vol. vii.), may be read with the greatest benefit. We believe they have all been republished separately, and we recollect how, many years ago, we were surprised to find in them such sound doctrine and unpresuming piety—as Dr. Jelf says, "singleness of purpose,—and withal, plain good sense, and pure English!"—*Editor's Preface*, p. xxvii. Brown, in his "*Britannia's Pastorals*," speaks of Daniel as the "well-lan-

<sup>8</sup> Apb. Abbot, in his Fifth Lecture on the Book of Jonah, has some striking remarks on this head. See pp. 89—91, ed. 4to, 1613. Dr. Jelf, in alluding to Jewel's mistaken views on this point, has the following very just remark: "And yet in an age, which is too much disposed to worship Mammon, the lesson need not be entirely thrown away. Avarice, exorbitant interest, extortion, and taking advantage of the necessities of our neighbours, are even now amenable to Jewel's severest rebuke."—Note, vol. vii. p. 63.



guaged Danyel." The same epithet—controversy apart—might be applied to Jewel.

The next year, 1570, we find the honest indignation of Jewel roused by Felton's posting up the Bull of Pope Pius V. on the Palace Gates of the Bishop of London. This Bull, it is well known, denounced Elizabeth as an heretic and a favourer of heretics, deprived her of her pretended title, and absolved her subjects from their oath of allegiance. Jewel was at this time engaged on his Lectures upon the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians (2. ii. 3); but such, it appears, was his earnestness, that he could not refrain, but at once declared its contents to his audience. Being a matter different from the Practical Exposition he was engaged upon, he entreats his hearers' pardon—"seeing the occasion is such, it driveth me to be plain and earnest. For she is the servant of God: she is my gracious lady and dread sovereign. I have sworn truth to her Majesty. If I knew there were in mine heart one drop of disloyal blood towards her, I would take my knife and let it out<sup>9</sup>." No doubt Jewel had found reason to be thus loyal, for the Bull itself bore date "the fifth of the Calend. of March, in the year past,"—that is, 25th February—and by this time heaven had worked. Besides the danger near at home, to it he attributes the rebellion of the Earls of Westmoreland and Northumberland, and the commotions in Scotland. "*Remember,*" says he, "*what ensued the summer following. The coals were kindled here, but the bellows which gave the wind lay at Rome, and there sat he which made the fire.*" Jewel asserts the same thing in his Letter to Bullinger, dated 7th Aug. 1570: "Omnes istas turbas nobis dedit sanctissimus pater! Is enim pro suâ sanctitate et sapientiâ submiserat in Angliam ad suos bullam (aureamne dicam et plumbeam?) magni ponderis. Ea menses aliquot inter paucos obscure fruebatur," &c. &c. To which he adds, "*Mitto ad te exemplar illius putidissimæ atque inanissimæ bullæ,*" &c. which "unworthy Bull," says Strype, in his Life and Acts of Archbishop Grindal, "Bullinger took the pains to answer," and sent it to England about August this year (i. e. 1571), "as he had also sent copies of it to the Bishops of Ely and Sarum, who were his acquaintance formerly in their exiles<sup>10</sup>."

Men's minds were in a transition state; and thousands (with no evil intent, but with an unformed judgment) were oscillating be-

<sup>9</sup> See View of a Seditious Bull, vol. vii. p. 237. See the Bull translated in Fuller's Church History, book ix. cent. xvi.; and the original in Burnet, II. ii. p. 531; and Cardwell's Doc. Annals, vol. i. p. 328.

<sup>10</sup> Strype's Grindal, p. 253.

tween Romanism and the doctrines of the Reformation<sup>1</sup>. On the whole,—even as admitted by Dr. Short,—the measures adopted by Elizabeth towards Rome had been conciliatory,—“and they were at first met by a corresponding return on the part of the majority so treated,”—so that “the Roman Catholics did generally conform to the worship of our Church, to which, though they might not have approved of all the alterations in it, they could raise no sound objection” (§ 437). But, after the promulgation of this Bull,—solicited by the importunity of Dr. Harding, Dr. Stapleton, Dr. Morton, and Dr. Webbe,—matters changed. The Roman Catholics no more came to worship,—all was suspicion, jealousy, conspiracy, and cabal,—and the result was, the enactment of those laws which, in one shape or another, pressed heavily upon them, and preserved us from their machinations, till the wisdom of the present century again gave free and open course to the “land-louping Jesuit,” thereby inflicting a wound on the Church of England and Ireland, which the present generation will not see healed! There’s no weapon salve for it! Most certainly we concur in Jewel’s indignation and earnestness; and, although

οὐ τοι ἅπανα κερδίων,  
φαίνοισα πρόσωπον ἀλάθει’ ἀτρεκῆς,

we may confidently refer any reader to “A View of a Seditious Bull” for truths which are not obsolete in 1850. The attacks of the Papacy are never to be made light of; and, though the Pope be not what he is represented,—

“Proin vide, ne, quem tu esse hebetem deputes æque ac pecus  
In sapientiâ, munitum pectus egregium gerat,  
Teque regno expellat’.”

At the same time, in making these remarks, and in expressing our deep-rooted dislike to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, let the insidious attacks of POPE SELF be well borne in mind; for time runs in a circle, and the same salient points are ever and anon touched upon, which left a slur on the Reformation in the days we are speaking of. Take what we allude to in Mr. Le Bas’ truthful words:—

“It must not be disguised, that the evils of that period were miserably aggravated by the apathy, or the perverseness which began to disgrace the followers of the Reformation. The zeal which had animated

<sup>1</sup> We particularly recommend to the reader’s attention the very sensible remarks of Mr. Le Bas on this head. *Life of Jewel*, p. 180, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Accius apud Cic. de Div. i. c. 23.

and united the Protestants, on the re-establishment of their faith at the accession of Elizabeth, was already waxing somewhat cold; and they who professed to retain most of its original fervour, were unhappily wasting their energy in the agitation of questions which lay on the outside of Christianity, instead of devoting it to the promotion of its vital and essential interests. And thus, strange as it may seem, while the Pope was labouring to empty our churches by denunciations from the Vatican, the Puritans were *virtually* aiding him by pouring contempt upon every thing which could remind the people of his authority, or even of his existence. And hence it was, that the enlightened friends of discipline and order were placed, as it were, between the upper and the nether mill-stone. They were assailed by enemies from abroad, and by false brethren at home. As the Puritanical controversy became more exasperated, the position of the Church of England became, of course, more critical and dangerous. That she has emerged in safety from the dangers which then environed her, and from the still more calamitous vicissitudes that followed, we gladly and thankfully ascribe to the protection of God's gracious providence."—p. 184.

We may note that, in the letter to Bullinger before quoted, he tells him that it is now six years full since he had seen Parkhurst, but that he was alive and well. It was written, it appears, on his visitation, the concluding words being, "*Ex itinere: nunc enim obo provinciam meam.*" Bullinger had written and complained of his silence, which accounts for it.

We arrive now at the last year of this great and good man's life—the year 1571, early in which (the 2nd of March) he writes to his friend Bullinger. This letter is, in part, a repetition of the last, under the idea that it might have been lost. Amongst the new matter, he refers to the silence of the Romanists. "*Lovanenses nostri,*" says he, "*unum jam atque alterum annum nihil scribunt;*" and he states, in conclusion, that two years' pension is due to "his Julius," to whom he had written that he might know to whom he might remit it, but had received no reply. But the most important point referred to is, the Parliament summoned for this year, with its Convocation, when he hoped once more to see the face of Parkhurst, whom he loved so well. The words run thus: "*Elizabetha Regina nostra convocavit proceres, et indixit parliamentum in secundum diem Aprilis; quod felix faustumque sit et ecclesiæ et reipublicæ. Ibi demum, spero, videbo Parkhurstum tuum meumque, quem septennium jam totum nunquam vidi.*" This point we consider the most important, because Jewel, as is well known, was much concerned in the revision and re-publication of the Articles, as well as in that requisite subscription which was brought about by the opposition of the Puri-



tanical party to existing regulations, headed by the notorious Thomas Cartwright. This, however, is another matter of great import, on which we have not space to dwell; in fact, it runs onward beyond the days of Jewel, and is to be coupled rather with those of Whitgift and Hooker. Suffice it to say, as regards Jewel, that on the 4th of May it was decided upon, "that when the Book of Articles touching doctrine shall be fully agreed upon, that then the same shall be put in print by the appointment of my Lord of Sarum<sup>4</sup>," which was done accordingly. Minute corrections were certainly made by Jewel, and he is justly said to have "put the finishing hand to our present articles;" but we doubt very much what is said by Mr. Soames, in his Elizabethan History, "that Jewel, then near his end, might seem to have omitted the affirmative clause in the XXth Article, which Burton branded, in Archbishop Laud's time, as a prelatical forgery."

With regard to the prevailing troubles to the coming Puritanical storm, we have Jewel's own testimony to his earnest anxiety. It was dwelt upon by him in his last sermon at Paul's Cross, and in his conference about the ceremonies and state of the Church. It was his earnest desire, that there should be peace; but when, in the stead of peace, the contrary faction prepared themselves for the battle, then he stood forward as the defender of existing institutions, and the Church as established in these realms. And all this, to a certain extent, must have been drawn from him by the pressure from without; for we know, from his residence at Zurich, how tender he was upon such points—how much he would have conceded. But now the hydra head of Puritanism was lifted up, the fruits that proved so bitter were beginning to ripen, and so one of the last acts of his valued life was the setting to paper his "*Novitiorum Assertio*" for the use of Whitgift. What appertains to it will be found in Strype,—the history in vol. i. p. 76,—the document itself in the Appendix, vol. iii. p. 21. As is well known, this paper was afterwards brought forward by Whitgift in his answer to the Admonition to Parliament.

Once more we find Jewel's name mentioned publicly, and that is in Queen Elizabeth's Letter to Archbishop Parker for uniformity in Church matters, given at Hatfield, the 28th day of August, 1571<sup>5</sup>. By this document the Archbishop was to asso-

<sup>4</sup> See the Acts and Proceedings in Convocation. Cardwell's Synodalia, vol. ii. p. 531, and Dr. Lamb's Historical Account of the XXXIX Articles. The question of the Articles is carefully canvassed by Dr. Short in his Sketch. See Appendix c. to chap. x., and his remarks are well worth reading. For the general history, see Strype's Parker; and, for the particular statement made by him, see vol. ii. p. 54.

<sup>5</sup> See Strype's Parker, vol. ii. p. 76, or Cardwell's Doc. Annals, vol. i. p. 332.

ciate with him the Bishops of London and Sarum, communicating these letters, and to charge them straitly to assist from time to time, between this and the month of October, to do all manner of things requisite to reform such abuses as afore are mentioned, in whomsoever ye shall find the same." But, or ever October came, good Jewel was released from toil and trouble, and from the sore weariness of earthly travel. He had begun "the travel of eternity!" His release had come,—

"For thoughe the day be never so long,  
At last the belles ringeth to even song"! "

Humphrey relates that he felt his end approaching, and that he had a strange perception of it some time before, as he declared by letters to his friend Parkhurst, whom he looked forward to see at that Parliament which he referred to likewise in his last letter to Bullinger. But it was with Jewel according to that proverb of the Germans,—*Geist kann man nicht verderben*; and so he laboured the more, the nigher he found his end approaching. But the account of his last days, so pathetically told, because so simply, we give in Master Featley's Abridgement of Humphrey, prefixed to the folio edition of Jewel's works. Long as it is, we question if any one will complain of its length<sup>7</sup>:

"The supernatural motions of God's Spirit within him in the end became, as it were natural, in *fine velociores*, and the last endeavours of grace in him were most vehement; for, after his return from a conference at London, he began a new and more severe visitation through his whole diocese than ever before, correcting the vices of clergy and laity more sharply, enjoining them in some places tasks of holy tracts to be learned by heart, conferring orders more circumspectly, and preaching oftener. By which restless labours and watchful cares he brought his feeble body so low, that, as he rode to preach at Lacock in Wiltshire, a gentleman friendly admonished him to return home for his health's sake, saying, 'that such straining his body in riding and preaching, being so exceeding weak and ill-affected, might bring him in danger of his life; assuring him, that it was better the people should want one sermon, than be altogether deprived of such a preacher.' To whom he replieth, 'It becometh best a Bishop to die preaching in the pulpit;' alluding peradventure to the apophthegm of Vespasian,—*Oportet imperatorem stantem mori*<sup>8</sup>; and seriously thinking upon the comfortable eulogy of his

<sup>6</sup> Hawes' Pastime of Pleasure, capit. xlii.

<sup>7</sup> We may add, in a note, that it was on this his last visitation, when 'he preached at Abingdon, a religious town in Berkshire, not far from Oxford,' that the well-known quotation was made by him from Gregory's Epistles, in which he gave the MS. reading *exercitus* instead of *exitus*.—See the story at length, quoted in Wordsworth's Eccl. Biog. iii. 350 and note, from Dr. James's Treatise, &c. Jewel not unfrequently quotes the passage, e. g. vol. ii. p. 142. vii. p. 174, and in Sermon on Haggai. Ibid. p. 377.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Sueton. in Vit. ad fin.

Master: *Happy art thou, my servant, if when I come I find thee so doing.* Wherefore, that he might not deceive the people's expectation, he ascendeth the pulpit; and now nothing but spirit (his flesh being pined away and exhausted) reads his text out of the fifth to the Galatians: *Walk in the Spirit, &c.*, and with much pain makes an end of it.

"Presently after sermon, his disease growing more upon him, forced him to take his bed, and to think of his dissolution now not far off. In the beginning of his extreme fits he made his will, considering therein his brother J. Jewel<sup>o</sup>, and his friends, with some kind remembrances, but bestowing the rest more liberally upon his servants, scholars, and the poor of Sarum. The Saturday following, nature, with all her forces (being able no longer to hold fight with the disease), shrinking and falling, he calleth all his household about him, and after an exposition of the Lord's prayer,—*Cantator cygnus funeris ipse sibi*,—thus he beginneth his sweet song:—

"I see I am now to go the way of all flesh, and I feel the arrows of death already fastened in my body; wherefore I am desirous in a few words, while yet my most merciful God vouchsafeth me the use of my tongue, to speak unto you all.—It was my prayer always unto Almighty God, since I had any understanding, that I might honour his name with the sacrifice of my flesh, and confirm his truth with the oblation of this my body unto death in the defence thereof; which seeing He hath not granted me in this, yet I somewhat rejoice and solace myself, that it is worn away and exhausted in the labours of my holy calling. For while I visit the people of God, God, my God, hath visited me with Mr. Harding, who provoked me first. I have contended in my writings not to detract from his credit and estimation, nor to patronize any error to my knowledge, nor to gain the vain applause of the world, but according to my poor ability to do my best service to God and his Church. My last Sermon at Paul's Cross, and Conference about the ceremonies and state of our Church, were not to please any man living, nor to grieve any of my brethren who are of a contrary opinion; but only to this end, that neither part might prejudice the other, and that the love of God might be shed in the hearts of all the brethren, through the Spirit that is given us. And I beseech Almighty God of his infinite mercy to convert or confound the head of all these evils, and ringleader of all rebellions, disorders, and schisms, the Bishop of Rome, who, wheresoever he setteth foot, soweth seeds of strife and contentions. I beseech Him also long to preserve the Queen's Majesty, to direct and protect her Council, to maintain and increase godly pastors, and to grant to his whole Church unity and godly peace. Also, I beseech you all that are about me, and all other whom I ever offended, to forgive me. And now that my hour is at hand, and all my moisture

<sup>o</sup> It is remarkable that Jewel's brother's name should have been John, but so it appears. Strype says, "he had a brother John, to whom he made bequests," &c. Parker, vol. ii. p. 49.



dried up, I most earnestly desire of you all this last duty of love, to pray for me, and help me with the ardency of your affection, when you perceive me, through the infirmity of my flesh, to languish and wax cold in my prayers. Hitherto I have taught you and many other; now the time is come wherein I may, and desire to, be taught and strengthened by every one of you."

"Having thus spoken, and something more to the like purpose, with much pain and interruption, he desired them to sing the 71st Psalm<sup>1</sup> (which begins thus: *In thee, O Lord, I put my trust, let me never be confounded*), himself joining as well as he could with them: and when they recited those words, *Thou art my hope, O Lord God, my trust even from my youth*, he added, *Thou only wast my whole hope*: and as they went forward, saying, *Cast me not off in the time of age, forsake me not when my strength faileth me; yea, even to mine old age and gray head, forsake me not, O God*; he made this application to himself, *He is an old man, he is truly gray-headed, and his strength faileth him, who lieth on his death-bed*. To which he added other thick and short prayers, as it were pulses, so moved by the power of God's Spirit, saying, *Lord, take from me my spirit; Lord, now let thy servant depart in peace; break off all delays; suffer thy servant to come unto thee; command him to be with thee; Lord, receive my spirit*.

"Here, when one of those that stood by prayed with tears, that (if it might stand with God's good pleasure) he would restore him to his former health, Jewel, over-hearing him, turned his eyes, as it were offended, and spake to him in the words of St. Ambrose<sup>2</sup>: *I have not lived so, that I am ashamed to live longer, neither do I fear to die, because we have a merciful Lord. A crown of righteousness is laid up for me. Christ is my righteousness. Father, let thy will be done, thy will, I say, and not my will which is imperfect and depraved. O Lord, confound me not, this my TO-DAY. This day quickly let me come unto thee: this day let me see the Lord Jesus*. With these words the door was shut by the base sound of the grinding, and the daughters of singing were abased, the silver cord lengthened no more, the golden ewer was crackt, and the pitcher broken at the well; yet the keepers, with much 'trembling, stood erect,' and they that looked out of the windows, though dark, were yet fixed toward heaven, till after a few fervent inward prayers of devotion, and sighs of longing desire, the soul returned to God that gave it. Master Ridley, the steward of his house, shut his

<sup>1</sup> John Garbrand's words are, in his Preface to A View of a Seditious Bull, "In the day and night before his departure out of this world, he expounded the Lord's Prayer, and gave short notes upon Psalm lxxi. to such as were by him." Vol. vii. p. 234.

The authorities for Humphrey's Life, it is well-known, were these, John Garbrand, Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, and his old tutor, Giles Laurence, who preached his funeral sermon, and his surviving brother. See Le Bas's Life, p. 237. The Dedication of Humphrey's Life is September 23, 1573, just two years after Jewel's death.

<sup>2</sup> Jewel presses the same words in his Treatise on the Sacraments. See vol. viii. p. 70.

eyes in the year of our Lord, 1571, Sept. 22 (*quære* 23d), about three of the clock in the afternoon, *ann. æt.* almost 50.—Such was the life and death of Bishop Jewel, a most worthy trumpet of Christ's glorious Gospel."

Nothing simpler or more touching than such an account as this! Like Richard Hooker, whom he patronized, like Barrow and many others who wrought much in a shorter space of time, and left a name behind not to be forgotten, Jewel, too, died young, at least, comparatively. But, "he lived long in the short scantling of his life;" and his works, now so well edited, tell one part of the labour of his days. We touch not upon the old saw, *Ὅν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος*,—as it is in Britannia's Pastorals,

"Since what is best lives seldom to be old;"—

because truth lies on both sides, and such an impression is usually dictated by feeling and affection; but we hint in passing, that the early death of the great and the good, who during life "kept the vigils of their Sabbath-day in heaven," calls upon all to labour in their vocation whilst their day lasts, and so to labour as that their labour be not in vain. "Sincerity, and simplicity, and perseverance, and performance, beseeem the child of God<sup>3</sup>." Happy such in their life—happier in their death!

*Εἰρηνικῶς θνήσκουσιν εἰρήνης τέκνα.*

None will visit fair Sarum's Cathedral without a thought of Jewel! Buried in the midst of the choir, we leave his ashes to sleep in quiet,—"*the pawn*," as old Fuller says, on another occasion, "*for the return of his soul!*"

Time and space fail us to tell of the calumnious insinuations, as well as of the open charges, made against him by the Romanist, who attributed his learning to his familiar—a huge black cat, to wit—declaring, at the same time, that he recanted on his death-bed, and died in the odour of sanctity and in the arms of Rome! confounded, nevertheless, at the errors of his life, and in the agonies of remorse and despair at the thought of them! After the peaceful end we have quoted at length, we leave our readers to reconcile such contradictions, referring only to the passage in Bacon's "Observations on a Libel," given as an instance of the height of impudency that these men are grown unto, in publishing and avouching untruths, on the principle of *audacter calumniari, semper aliquid hæret*:—"Mr. Jewel, the Bishop of Salisbury, who, according to his life, died most godly and patiently, at the point of death used the versicle of the hymn 'Te Deum, O Lord, in Thee have I trusted, let me never be confounded,' whereupon,

<sup>3</sup> Abbot on Jonah, p. 169.

suppressing the rest, they published that the principal champion of the heretics in his very last words cried he was confounded<sup>4</sup>!" More on these points must be sought for in the Life of Humphrey.

In the stead of dwelling on such matters, we will now turn to his general life and character, by way of summary, which was not so easily introduced into the annals of his public career;—and here, as before, we shall pretty closely follow Mr. Le Bas, whose selections, as usual, are pertinent and judicious.

As a scholar and a divine it must be admitted that JEWEL was amongst the first men of his time. A hard student from his earliest days till the day of his death, he was, as Eunapius says of Longinus, a *Βιβλιοθήκη τις ἑμψυχος καὶ περιπατοῦν μουσεῖον*, but without ostentation, and without the pride of learning. Knowledge puffed him not up, but humbled him, teaching him the extent of his own ignorance, and so turning every endowment of his mind to the service of God and his Church; for, as himself said, "he is over well-learned, that bendeth his learning against God." His memory, which Lord Brooke calls the

"Register of sense

And mould of arts, and mother of induction,"

was wonderful; neither was it such by nature only, but improved by art, for he used what has since been called a "*Memoria Technica*," and taught it, amongst others, to his old friend and tutor, Parkhurst. Strange feats are recorded by his biographers,—as strange as of Fuller, in after-days. But, as Bishop Morton said, "*no man's memory is omnipotent*," and Jewel accordingly had immense stores laid up in his Common-place Books<sup>5</sup>, made ready to his hand by carefully digested indexes—"many in number, and great in quantity, being a vast treasure of learning, and a rich repository of knowledge, into which he had collected sacred, profane, poetic, philosophic, and divine notes, of all sorts;" but the indexes, it appears, were drawn up in characters for brevity, and thereby so obscured, that they were not of any use, after his death, to any other person. And, besides these, he ever kept

<sup>4</sup> See Works, vol. v. p. 469, 8vo.

<sup>5</sup> The immense stores of all sorts of information contained in the lamented Southey's Common-place Book will, in due time, be given to the world. We expected to have seen the first volume before this. Years ago we were delighted with the privilege of turning them over. He drew upon them in his *Vindiciæ*, &c., as Jewel did upon his in his controversy with Harding. Southey, by the way, to use the words of Marston in his "Scourge of Villany,"

"*Had made a common-place book out of plays.*"

We saw it many years ago, and regret to hear that it has been lost. Since this was written three series of these Common-place Books have been published, and the fourth is advertised as nearly ready. The mass of information they contain is wonderful,—and the labours of preparing them has been, as we have good occasion to know, immense.



diaries, in which he entered whatever he heard or saw that was remarkable ; which once a year he perused, and out of them extracted whatever was more remarkable. To speak of Jewel's knowledge of Latin and Greek were superfluous ; but his love for Horace and Cicero, for the Greek poets, orators, and historians has been recorded. In these, it is said, he was especially well versed, but above all, in the ecclesiastical historians. It is mentioned, likewise, that Gregory Nazianzen was a particular favourite with him, and that he quoted him on all occasions. We all know Barrow's love for Chrysostom, and how he studied the golden-mouthed Father in the imperial city where he preached. We must not omit to add, that Erasmus stood very high also in the estimation of Jewel.

And, thus prepared, he came to the work he had in hand, and from these his immense collections he was enabled not only to proclaim the Challenge from Paul's Cross, in the cool and positive way he did, but likewise to confront the combined efforts of the Romanists ; for, as we observed before, the controversy was not so much with Harding, as with the whole consistory of the Papistic doctors. We have not space to record how he used his note-books in the contest ; but the reader may inform himself fully by turning to the life of Jewel by a Person of Quality, in Wordsworth's *Eccles. Biogr.*, vol. iii. p. 355.

But, if Jewel was a scholar and a divine, he was more also. He was the most faithful in all his ministerial duties ; and, although many particulars are not handed down to us, yet, when Whitgift numbered him among "the most notable and painful prelates" of his time, we know that he gave utterance to the common testimony of all good men in his favour. So that if

" The gyse now-a-days  
Of some jangling jayes  
Is to discommend,  
What they cannot amend<sup>6</sup>,"

they have but to turn to Jewel's contemporaries, and to the divines of the following generation ; and there they will find equal-handed justice dealt out to "the bright and shining light," who did as much as ever any man did to shoulder back the *τρικυβία*,—the *fluctus decumanus* of the roaring Papacy<sup>7</sup>. "We saw the poppets," are his words, "but the juggler that drew the strings kept himself close<sup>8</sup>."

If we follow him to his diocese, there we find him, like Paul of

<sup>6</sup> Skelton's "Philip Sparowe."

<sup>7</sup> It is old Burton in his "Anatomic of Melancholic" that speaks of the "*Bull bellowing Pope*" and the "*Land-louping Jesuits*."

<sup>8</sup> Vol. vii. p. 281. "View of a Seditious Bull."

old, in labours more abundant. Day and night he seems to have devoted to the exercise of his calling, "insomuch that it was a question whether his mental or his bodily labours were the more." And if he was, as a Bishop ought to be, διδακτικός, he was also φιλόξενος; and though, as he said on his arrival in his see, "Capon had devoured all," yet he found means by rigid economy to exercise, in no common degree, the virtues of hospitality and munificence. His doors were open,—without respect of persons, save and except any came from Zurich and from Peter Martyr, and then there might be,—to all who were his proper guests; and for the sick and needy none could say, with more truth than Old Sarum's Bishop,

"The threshold of my door  
Is worn by the poor<sup>9</sup>."

Few readers of Bishop Latimer's Sermons will forget his indignant pleading for poor scholars,—as, for example, in that preached at Stamford:—"Every man scrapeth," says he, "and getteth together for his bodily house; but the soul's health is neglected. Schools are not maintained; scholars have not exhibition; the preaching office decayeth; men provide lands and riches for their children, but this most necessary office they for the most part neglect. *Very few there be that help poor scholars*; that set their children to school to learn the Word of God, and to make a provision for the age to come<sup>10</sup>." So spake this thorough and most honest martyr to Christ. But no imputation of this sort clung to Jewel; none knew the necessities of the times more than he, and none did more than he to stay the evil, yea, even beyond his power. Usually, we find, he had with him in his house half a dozen or more poor lads which he brought up in learning; and took much delight to hear them dispute points of grammar, learning in Latin at his table when he was at his meal, improving them and pleasing himself at the same time. And besides these he maintained in the University several young students, allowing them yearly pensions, and, whenever they came to visit him, rarely dismissed them without liberal gratuities, following in this the solid example set him by his dear friend and tutor Parkhurst, when at Cleave. And never was example better followed, or more gloriously rewarded; for it was by Jewel's bounty that Richard Hooker was trained in that scholarship which produced that most invalu-

<sup>9</sup> See Herrick's *Hesperides*. It is to be recollected, that it was in 1572 that provision was, what is called, legally made for the poor. We may refer to some very judicious remarks on this head by Bp. Short, in his *Sketch*, &c. § 436. Jones of Nayland observes the same, vol. iv. p. 160: and we are still searching for what Warburton says was not found in his day, that is, "the proper remedy." Vol. x. p. 257.

<sup>10</sup> Vol. i. p. 291. Park. ed.

able and never-to-be-dispraised work, THE ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

This beautiful episode in Jewel's history no reader of the "meek Walton"—meek, notwithstanding Lord Byron's flippant and indecent remark,—knoweth not. It appears that when Jewel was appointed Commissioner for the West of England, as we have recorded in its proper place, he then became acquainted with John Hooker, at that time Chamberlain of Exeter, Richard's uncle, who had been induced, on the representation of the boy's kind-hearted schoolmaster, to forward his nephew's education. For further particulars,—how the uncle, on Jewel's coming to his diocese, interceded with him for the lad,—how he had him brought to him, in company with his schoolmaster, the Easter following,—how he rewarded the schoolmaster, and pensioned Richard's parents, and took upon himself his case for a future preferment,—for these and other points we must refer to those pages, of which Wordsworth says,

*"The feather whence the pen  
Was shaped, that traced the lives of these good men,  
Dropt from an angel's wing ;"—*

but we cannot resist giving the conclusion<sup>1</sup>—(it was after Hooker's sore sickness)—in the simple words of that most touching of all biographers :—

"As soon as he was perfectly recovered from this sickness, he took a journey from Oxford to Exeter, to satisfy and see his good mother, being accompanied with a countryman, and companion of his own college, and both on foot : which was then either more in fashion, or want of money, or their humility made it so : but on foot they went, and took Salisbury in their way, purposely to see the good Bishop, who made Mr. Hooker and his companion dine with him at his own table :

<sup>1</sup> Thus alluded to in the same Poet's Ecclesiastical Sketches, under the head of "Eminent Reformers," part ii. xxxii.

*"Methinks that I could trip o'er heaviest soil,  
Light as a buoyant bark from wave to wave,  
Were mine the trusty staff that JEWEL gave  
To youthful HOOKER, in familiar style  
The gift exalting, and with playful smile :  
For thus equipped, and bearing on his head  
The Donor's farewell blessing, can he dread  
Tempest, or length of way, or weight of toil ?  
More sweet than odours caught by him who sails  
Near spicy shores of Araby the blest,  
A thousand times more exquisitely sweet,  
The freight of holy feeling which we meet,  
In thoughtful moments, wafted by the gales  
From fields where good men walk, or bowers where they rest."*

In the simile of "Araby the blest" it may be almost needless to say that Wordsworth, as well as Cowper (his lines are very beautiful), both follow Milton.



which Mr. Hooker boasted of with much joy and gratitude, when he saw his mother and friends : and at the Bishop's parting with him, the Bishop gave him good counsel, and his benediction, but forgot to give him money ; which, when the Bishop had considered, he sent a servant in all haste to call Richard back to him ; and at Richard's return the Bishop said to him, Richard, *I sent for you back to lend you a horse, which hath carried me many a mile, I thank God, with much ease ; and presently delivered into his hand a walking staff, with which he professed he had travelled through many parts of Germany. And he said, Richard, I do not give, but lend you my horse ; be sure you be honest, and bring my horse back to me at your return this way to Oxford. And I do now give you ten groats, to bear your charges to Exeter ; and here is ten groats more, which I charge you to deliver to your mother, and tell her I send her a Bishop's benediction with it, and beg the continuance of her prayers for me. And, if you bring my horse back to me, I will give you ten groats more, to carry you back to the College ; and so God bless you, good Richard.*

" And this, you may believe, was performed by both parties. But, alas ! the next news that followed Mr. Hooker to Oxford was, that his learned and charitable patron had changed this for a better life. Which happy change may be believed, for that as he lived, so he died, in devout meditation and prayer ; and in both so zealously, that it became a religious question, *Whether his last ejaculations or his soul did first enter into heaven.*"

His munificence was further shown by the building a library for his Cathedral. Books, he knew, were to the divine what tools are to a carpenter, and he took care that there should be a proper depository for the after liberality of others. The original library, which belonged to Old Sarum, was founded by Bishop Osmund ; but of its contents little or nothing is known, save only as regards the book called the " Custom," composed by him. From his time Salisbury became, as we know from Caxton, the great authority on all such matters ; and when the Archbishop of Canterbury celebrated the Liturgy in the presence of the Bishops of his province, the Bishop of Salisbury (probably in consequence of the general adoption<sup>2</sup> of the " Use" of Sarum) acted as Precentor of the College of Bishops, a title which he still retains. But this by the way, and because no Cathedral Church is so rich as Salisbury in what appertains to its ritual. Of more consequence is it to remark, that Jewel was not deceived in his anticipations ; for his very next successor, Edmund Gheast (Almoner to Queen Elizabeth, and of great use in settling the affairs of the Reforma-

<sup>2</sup> See Mr. Palmer's Dissertation on the Liturgy of Britain and Ireland *Orig. Liturg.*, vol. i. p. 187.

tion<sup>3</sup>) supplied it with a collection of books. Both their names are perpetuated in the following inscription, which we transcribe from Godwin's *De Præsulibus Angliæ*:—"Hæc Bibliotheca instructa est sumptibus R. P. ac D. D. Joannis Jewelli, instructa verò libris à R. in Christo P. D. Edmundo Gheast, olim ejusdem Ecclesiæ Episcopo, quorum memoria in benedictione erit." For the praise of those who build libraries,—second only to that of those who build churches and hospitals,—we beg to refer our readers to the "Oratio in obitum Thomæ Bodleii," by the ever-memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eaton.

Elizabeth, it is well known in the present day, pillaged the Church most unmercifully. As Bishop Short says<sup>4</sup>, "she did not begin the custom, but she ought to have put a stop to it." Jewel, however, stepped forth on all occasions, as Latimer had done aforetime, and endeavoured to stem the evil. He did what he could, and his praise remains. Allowances are to be made for what we will call the complimentary language of his day; but courtier, in a bad sense, was he none. No prebend in his day, and with his good will, could make a merchandize of the Church's patrimony; and when one layman came on such an errand, backed by legal authority, his well-known reply still stands on record:—"What your lawyers may answer, I know not. But this I know, —that I will take care that my Church shall sustain no loss while I live." Nor, in the presence of his Sovereign Lady the Queen was his tongue tied. Nor love of place, nor forfeiture of favour, would have influenced him. Witness his well-known sermon on Psalm lxi. 19: "*The zeal of thine house hath eaten me*"<sup>5</sup>. We wish we had space to extract the whole, as well as other passages to the same extent; a part we cannot refrain from giving, inasmuch as in our days the results of constant spoliation are so clear. "*Solvat Ecclesia*" is still the cry which produces Tithe Commutations and Ecclesiastical Commissions! Save the mark! What a pliant thing is a "cheveril conscience"<sup>6</sup>!

"All other labourers and artificers have their hire increased doubly as much as it was wont to be, only the poor man that laboureth and sweateth in the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts hath his hire abridged

<sup>3</sup> Parker, vol. ii. 459. The name is severally spelt, *Gest* or *Guest*. See Index to Strype.

<sup>4</sup> See his very true remarks. Sketch, § 429.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. vii. p. 400. The passage referred to is in p. 413.

<sup>6</sup> Few people, nowadays, are conversant with old Quarles' "Divine Fancies;" but, if any chance to have the book, they will find some very plain remarks there, under "ANANIAS," lib. iii. 82, and "ON IMPROPRIATOR," lib. iv. 73, 74. He elsewhere says:

"*They're two things to be worldly great and wise.*"

and abated. I speak not of the curates, but of parsonages and vicarages, that is, of the places which are the castles and towers of peace for the Lord's temple. They seldom pass nowadays from the patron, if he be no better than a gentleman, but either for the lease or for present money. Such merchants are broken into the Church of God, a great deal more intolerable than were they whom Christ chased and whipped out of the Temple. Thus they, that should be careful of God's Church, that should be patrons to provide for the consciences of the people, and to place among themselves her ministers, who might be able to preach the word unto them, out of season and in season, and to fulfil his ministry, seek their own and not that which is Jesus Christ's. They serve not Jesus Christ, but their belly. And this is done, not in one place, or in one country, but throughout England. A gentleman cannot keep his house, unless he have a parsonage or two in farm for its provision.

"O merciful God, whereto will this grow at last? If the misery which the plague worketh would reach but to one age, it were tolerable. But it will be a plague to the posterity, it will be the decay and desolation of God's Church. Young men, which are toward and learned, see this; they see that he which feedeth the flock hath least part of the milk: he which goeth a warfare hath not half his wages. Therefore they are weary and discouraged, they change their studies: some become prentices, some turn to physic, some to law: all shun and flee the ministry. And besides the hindrance that thus groweth by wicked dealing of patrons, by reason of the impropriations, the vicarages, in many places, and in the properest market towns, are so simple, that no man can live upon them, and therefore no man will take them. They were wont to say, '*Beneficia sine curâ*,' 'Benefices without charge:' but now may be said, '*Cura sine beneficio*,' 'Charge or cure without benefice.'"

All this, the reader must bear in mind, was preached in the ears of Elizabeth,—no common woman, and one who, when provoked, declared herself to be of the masculine, and the feminine, and the neuter gender too; one whose vanity was easily ruffled, and before whom a "*prudens simplicitas*" was advisable. But Jewel was a truth-teller, when truth was needed, and he spoke before her as honest old Latimer did in his first and sixth sermons before Edward VI.<sup>7</sup> At this day the back-wave of spoliation is

<sup>7</sup> In the first sermon he says, "There lieth a great matter by these appropriations, great reformation is to be had in them. I know where is a great market town, with divers hamlets and inhabitants, where do rise yearly of their labour to the value of fifty-pound, and the vicar that serveth (being so great a cure) hath not twelve or fourteen marks by year; so that of this pension he is not able to buy him books, nor to give his neighbour drink: all the great gain goeth another way." p. 100.—In the sixth he tells us, how the Devil "invented fee-farming of benefices, and all to decay this office of preaching; inasmuch that, when any man hereafter shall have a benefice, he may go where he will, for any house he shall have to dwell upon, or any glebe land to keep hospitality withal: but he must take up a chamber



still rolling in, and our poorer livings are quite inadequate to the decent maintenance of a clergyman; and "was it not," as one says, "for the piety of those who, through the possession of private property, are enabled to devote their talents to the service of God, by entering into the ministry, a great number of parishes in England would be destitute of an educated pastor."

Having referred to his sermons, we may state that, polemical as some are, they are still most scriptural; and if, as Luther said, a good textman be proof of a good divine, Jewel must have been eminently such. The Scriptures were at his fingers' ends and in all his writings he shows, practically, what he years before declared to Dr. Cole: "Like as the errors of the clock be revealed by the constant course of the sun, even so the errors of the Church are revealed by the everlasting and infallible word of God<sup>s</sup>." Of the style we said something before. We may here add, that he is plainness itself; and proper words (Swift's test of a good style) are always to be found in proper places. In the words of one of his biographers, "He affected ever rather to express himself fluently, neatly, and with great weight of argument and strength of reason, than in hunting after the flowers of rhetoric, and the cadence of words: though he understood them, no man better, and wrote a dialogue<sup>o</sup>, in which he comprehended the sum of the art of rhetoric:" or, in the original words of Humphrey: "*Curiosam et affectatam eloquentiam in concionatoribus semper damnavit, et ipse devitavit. Rhetor esse quam haberi maluit.*" He that harangued in his younger days the woods of Shotover spake of the things of Christ sweetly and persuasively,—"*leni ac dulci voce, et idoneis verbis.*" But his own views on this head he had presented to the reader in his sermon on Joshua vi. 1—3, and they are well worth perusing. See vol. vii. pp. 362, 363.

in an ale-house, and there sit and play at the tables all the day. A goodly curate!" p. 203. Park. edit.—Who need wonder, after such instances, that Cock, Gammer Gurton's boy, should be sent by his master to seek Doctor Rat,

"at Hobfilchers shop; for as charde it reported

Ther's the best *ale* in all the town, and now is most resorted?"—ii. iii.

<sup>8</sup> Vol. i. p. 127.

<sup>9</sup> The academical prolusion, now printed for the first time by Dr. Jelf from a MS. in the British Museum, collated with two others in C. C. C., can hardly be here alluded to. It is quite worth reading. The title is *In Rhetoricæ Vituperium*. See vol. viii. p. 209. The following story is new to us, and may be so to some of our readers:—

"Muliercula quædam olim Cantiana, cum Lundini forte, in magnum numerum juvenum nobilium, qui tum juri publico operam de more dabant, incidisset; percontata quinam essent, aut quid vellent, cum eos legum studiosos et etiam brevi tempore jurisperitos et patronos fore accepisset: O res (inquit) perditas, o miseram atque infelicem rempub. ! Rogata, cur ita se affligeret, mulier ignota et peregrina: Quoniam jurisperitus (inquit) apud nos unus jampridem omnium fortunas compilavit, et regionem totam exhaustit."—p. 217.

The question as to whether Jewel saw the evils of Puritanism, was slightly touched upon before ; and we have not space to dwell upon that point now. Engaged with the Romanist, probably he did not. And, as for Calvin, he thought of him as did many of our great divines, that is to say, as a reverend father and worthy ornament of the Church of God<sup>1</sup>. The immediate danger was from Rome ; and Calvin, being altogether opposed to the Papacy, was naturally an ally of Protestants. But to say that Jewel brought back with him from the Continent nothing but the general spirit of Protestantism, and that he left behind him the peculiar spirit of the Church of England, is not the case, as Mr. Le Bas has well argued. Jewel was, in truth, on all occasions, a sober defender of ecclesiastical discipline ; and that the platform of Geneva was contrary to his views is evidently to be inferred from his opposition to Humphrey's institution before referred to. Acts speak stronger than words, and so did Jewel's. Tender upon these points, and very fearful of the Romish moss and lichen again creeping over the pillars of our sanctuary, which had been so lately scraped, no doubt he was ; but we warn all those who may be in the way of hearing Jewel's name traduced as an "irreverent dissenter," at once to rebut the charge, and to acknowledge him to be, as he was, a true and worthy member of the Holy Catholic Church. As for the term Roman Catholic, now so familiar, it is, as Dr. Overal says in his Preface to Jewel's Works, "either a *contradictio in adjecto*, using Catholic for the Universal Church (as it signifies properly), or, at least, a *terminus diminuens*, taking Catholic (as it is commonly used) for orthodoxal."

But we find that we cannot enter into more particulars. Suffice it to say, that he was the constant preacher, even in the meanest village of his diocese ; on which occasions, as on all others, he dared not to speak without precedent meditation, and writing also the chief heads of his sermons. Extemporaneous his preaching might be, to a certain extent, as we collect from the sermon at Paul's Cross, but unprepared was it never. His notes probably were longer than any modern discourse. Reynolds, and Whitaker, and Bilson, and Abbot, all "tinded their candles" at his and Peter Martyr's torches, as Master Featley remarked ; and, notwithstanding all differences on points,—great differences, we are ready to admit,—they shone gloriously. No matter where we look for Jewel, whether on his visitations, or in his closet, or in his chancery, there he was always the same ; the mild and cheerful Bishop of the Church of God, the defender of the poor, the encourager of religious and useful learning, the friend and the beloved

<sup>1</sup> Defence of the Apol. pt. ii, chap. 7. div. 2. vol. iv. p. 517.

of all good men, an angel in his life, his enemies themselves being judges. Sarum, says Featley, in the "*Abel Redivivus*," was his *golden candlestick*, and there "he shined most brightly for eleven years, and after his extinction by death left a most sweet smell behind him, the savour of a good name, much more precious than ointment, for his apostolic doctrine, and saintlike life, and prudent government, and incorrupt integrity, unspotted chastity, and bountiful hospitality<sup>2</sup>."

Thus, as the new edition of his works has given us fit and proper occasion was it our wish to speak,—how imperfectly have we spoke!—of reverend Jewel;—a man, like other men, of sins, and weaknesses, and short-comings, and doubts, and misgivings; but withal a mighty prelate of the Church of Christ, a humble penitent, a saint, who, in the midst of all his troubles, had joy in the Holy Ghost! Imperfectly, however, as we have spoken of a name never to be forgotten by all good Protestants, we have done it, not forgetful of the great moral truth conveyed in those lines of William Browne, in that beautiful poem, "*The Britannia's Pastorals*:"—

"FOR EVER WHERE TRUE WORTH FOR PRAISE DOTH CALL,  
HE RIGHTLY NOTHING GIVES THAT GIVES NOT ALL!"

We ought to add, in conclusion, that no trace, up to the present time, remains of his Paraphrase and Interpretation of the Epistles and Gospels throughout the whole year,—of his continue Exposition of the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments,—of his Commentary upon the Epistle to the Galatians, or of that on the First of Peter. John Garbrand, it is well known, published the posthumous works we have; and the other loose sheets and MSS. on his death fell into the hands of Robert Chaloner and John Rainold, doctors of divinity, as we are informed by Antony à Wood. "What became," says Dr. Jelf, "of these MSS. subsequently we are not informed. It

<sup>2</sup> We transcribe from the "*Abel Redivivus*" the concluding well-known verses, "done by Master Quarles, father or son":—

"Holy learning, sacred arts;  
Gifts of Nature, strength of parts;  
Fluent grace, an humble minde;  
Worth reform'd, and wit refine;  
I witnesse both in tongue and pen;  
Insight both in Booke and men;  
Hopes in woe, and feares in weale;  
Humble knowledge, sprightly zeale;  
A liberal heart, and free from gall;  
Close to friends and true to all.  
Height of courage in truth's duell;  
Are the stones that made this Jewell.  
Let him that would be truly blest,  
Weare this Jewell in his breast."



seems probable, however, that Garbrand himself, who lived five years after he had published the posthumous works, purposely excluded the treatises in question from the number. Admitting, therefore, in general, that the dust of such a man is gold, we may perhaps console ourselves under the disappointment of a fruitless search, by the conjecture that the lost works, however useful in their generation, were not considered by the author's intimate friend and literary devisee of sufficient importance to warrant their publication."—*Editor's Preface*, p. xxx.

We promised to conclude with some few warnings suggested by the existing state of Romanism amongst us,—an aggressive rather than a spiritual power, which, constituted as it is, and as long as it abides by the creed of Pope Pius IV. it always must be, can never be encouraged with safety; for, once let the *κύρια δόξα* of the Papacy become naturalized, and they will eat as doth a canker, turning religion into rebellion, and faith into faction. We have not sufficient proofs at hand for a detailed analyzation of the matter, but we do sadly believe, from observation, that a good deal of present disturbance arises from that leaven of unruliness which is fostered in the uneducated breasts of wild Roman Catholics, turned loose upon society. Sufficient, and more than sufficient, blame attaches to ourselves, as a nation, for not looking to the spiritual improvement of our people. But we cannot forget that our huge mobs, as well in London as in the manufacturing districts, are swelled into "a tympany" by masses of Irish, and we much fear that the poor and ignorant amongst them, which constitute the multitude,—as, for example, in St. George's, Manchester,—are not held back by that implicit obedience which is a tenet of their Church. On the contrary, that implicit obedience must array them against the Protestant Church, and invidiously lead them on to acts of insubordination inconsistent with peace and quietness and good government. We wish we may be deceived in our surmises, and that the letter from the Vatican may be the means of repressing seditious priests in Ireland. Certainly, before its arrival we were asking, with Jewel in his Apology, "*An pontifex ista à suis dici nescit? aut tales se habere patronos non intelligit?*" We have enough of ungodliness—we had almost said atheism—to answer for ourselves. God in His mercy turn from us "sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion!"

But, at the tail of a long article, we find we have not room to enter upon this point—the back-wave of '29—as we ought to do. We will therefore advert to a few heads, which we think of material consequence, because there are many who suppose that the

Roman Catholics are not now what they were ; and that, as Mr. Henry Drummond said in the House in the debate on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, there is " a most essential difference between the dead Papists of books and the real live Roman Catholics ;" while, as we ourselves know quite well, Rome *quâ* Rome admits of no change, though she may, as in the case of Developement, now and then take a false step <sup>4</sup>.

I. And, firstly, let all who are harnessing themselves for the battle be prepared well on the subject of the Supremacy ; for on this, after all, the whole matter will turn. " A man," says Bishop Croft in his *Legacy*, " would wonder to see them, like cats, knocked down and quite dead in all appearance, yet rise up again with this text in their mouths,—*"Thou art Peter,"* &c. <sup>5</sup> Yet so it is, and the Supremacy and consequent Infallibility of the Church of Rome is a point which will ever be insisted upon by her followers. Happily, we have a work at hand from which every reader may draw sufficient proofs of the falsity of the position : we allude, of course, to " Barrow's Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy," and to this we may confidently refer, though, as Tillotson says in his Preface, it " wants the finish of his last hand." This point, we need not inform our readers, was a portion of Jewel's Challenge, and is dwelt upon at great length in the Reply to Harding (Vol. ii. pp. 130—318). Coupled with " Barrow's Treatise," it affords a perfect armoury for authorities, and we may assert, in its concluding words, " That albeit Mr. Harding have travailed painfully herein, both by himself, and also on conference with his friends, yet cannot he hitherto find, neither in the Scriptures, nor in old Councils, nor in any one of all the ancient Catholic Fathers, that the Bishop of Rome, within the space of the first six hundred years after Christ, was ever entitled, either the Universal Bishop, or the head of the Universal Church." The whole, in fact, is a figment, and no record exists ; and we might say, as Donato did to Julius II., when that haughty pontiff asked him, what title Venice had to the sovereignty of the Adriatic ? " Your Holiness will find it on the back of the record of Constantine's donation of Rome to the Pope !"

II. We must warn all those who have not studied the deep

<sup>4</sup> We may refer here to what Dr. C. Wordsworth says in his 9th Letter to M. Jules Gondou : " By the reception of the Author of this Essay of the Developement, with this unhappy book in his hands, and by proclaiming his *conversion* as a signal and glorious *triumph*, instead of censuring him and his work as promoting heresy and infidelity, the Church of Rome has publicly declared to the world, that there is no truth so sacred which may not be assailed in her communion, no error so destructive to Christianity, and derogatory to the Divine dignity, which may not be professed there, especially if the assault of truth and the profession of error be for the purpose of maintaining the Supremacy of the Pope."—p. 230.

<sup>5</sup> See pp. 57—59. 4to, 1679.

cunning of Rome to beware! We are not to be deceived by specious pretences. It is the character of the Church of Rome not to advance a jot. All must be concession upon the part of Protestants, and they must virtually confess themselves to be schismatics, if they will be at one with Romanists. And then comes the question, Can we as Protestants concede to Romish error once more? The answer is simply this:—

QUID ROMÆ FACIAM? MENTIRI NESCIO.

None more than ourselves wish for reconciliation; but, as long as the pretensions of the Papacy remain unchanged, the gulf is impassable. All recent discussion shows this, and we see at least the deep wisdom of Bishop Morton, who “dehorted the dishonest Spalatensis (*i. e.* M. Antonio de Dominis) “from his vagary into Italy, to accommodate truth and peace, for the Italians would never be persuaded to retract an error!” We all know the end of him, and of his broad motto of union and concord, Rome and England<sup>6</sup>. Later attempts have fared no better even in honest hands. We need scarce refer to the honoured name of Archbishop Wake, or defend him from the remarks in the Confessional; but our readers will quite understand, after what has here been said, the meaning of the words which follow: “*Ces liaisons étoient innocentes, et Mr. Du Pin ne les entretenoit que pour l'honneur et l'avantage de l'église.*” Lesley and Bull and Nelson were willing to do what they could, but all was fruitless.

III. As for our diplomatic relations with Rome, we shall be sorry to see the day when they are established *according to the wishes of the Romanists*<sup>7</sup>.

“Hoc Ithacus velit, et magno mercentur Atridæ!”

Luckily, for the present, there seems to be a hitch, and “the common witte, the first of wittes all,” that is to say, plain common sense, as yet stops the gap. “The last leger of the English nation to Rome, publicly avowed in that employment,” says

<sup>6</sup> The Bishop of London, in his much-abused charge, has referred to this incident. It will be found in Hacket's Life of Archbishop Williams, p. 108. We may here thank Dr. Wordsworth for his reprint of R. Crakanthorp's “*Defensio Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ contra Archiepisc. Spalatens.*,” which is before us. When we think of de Dominis, we cannot but call to mind the words of Mendoza in the Malcontent,

“A churchman once corrupted, O avoid;  
A fellow that makes religion his stalking horse.”

<sup>7</sup> We bear in mind those words, “*Statuimus, id est abrogamus.*” See Letters between Bishop of Sarum and Dr. Cole, vol i. p. 54. This would be the language of the Vatican, when likely to be received. Certainly, “*In novis rebus constituendis evidens debet esse utilitas.*” See p. 48.



Fuller<sup>8</sup>, was Sir Edward Carne, who “pretended that, as the Queen would not suffer the Pope’s nuncio to come into England, so the Pope would not permit him to depart Rome; whereas, indeed, the cunning old man was not detained, but detained himself, so well pleased was he with the place, and his office therein, where soon after he died.” The mission of Roger, Earl of Castlemain, we make no account of, as he was sent by James II.; but it were ominous, were our Sovereign Lady the Queen to accredit an envoy there in 1850! Whom the Pope might send here is, possibly, since the Duke of Wellington’s remark (very unpalatable, as is to be picked out from recent letters); but, as the Black Bishop’s Pawn says on Middleton’s Game at Chess,—(though a play, a play well worth reading on this head),—there are plenty of Jesuits ready, at the Pope’s bidding, to gull John Bull, if he please to be gulled.

“They’re not idle,  
He finds them all true labourers in the work  
Of th’ universal monarchy, which he  
And his disciples principally aim at:  
Those are maintained in many courts and palaces,  
And are induced by noble personages  
Into great princes’ services, and prove  
Some councillors of state, some secretaries;  
All bring in notes of intelligence—  
As parish-clerks their mortuary bills—  
To the Father General: so are designs  
Oft-times prevented, and important secrets  
Of states discovered, yet no author found,  
But they suspected oft that are most sound.”

When the Earl of Arundel and Surrey tells us that “the Jesuits are the most loyal subjects of any government under which they live, whether republican or despotic<sup>9</sup>,” we must beg to demur, and call to his recollection their expulsion from the various countries of Europe no less than thirty-seven times between 1555 and 1773. Neither can we ourselves forget that Louis de Montalte, the author of the *Lettres Provinciales*, was no less a person than the celebrated Pascal, whose testimony is clean and quite on the other side the question. True are the words of Henry King (some time Bishop of Chichester)—

—“Rebellion wants no Cad nor Elfe,  
But is a perfect witchcraft of itself.”

<sup>8</sup> Church History, book ix. cent. xvi.

<sup>9</sup> Debate on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, “Times,” June 1, 1848.

IV. "But," saith the Romanist, "your Anglican Church is so full of differences and dissensions, that there is no rest for restless souls—no balm in such a Gilead. 'A quiet life doth pass an empery,' but quiet in such a schismatic Church there can be none!" And with suchlike words the weak are beguiled, and, as in the first Charles's time, so now, they are drawn into the Maelstrom, by visions of comfort, before they are aware. Now, in all this again, there is subtilty and delusion, and Jesuitic cunning; and the boasted successor of St. Peter seems forgetful of St. Paul's words (1 Cor. xi. 18, 19), who was not a whit behind the chiefest of the apostles. The real truth of the matter is (a mighty warning this!)—that in the Romish Church, with all its vaunted unity, there is perhaps more division than in any other. "Not to mention," says good old Adam Littleton, whose sermons will rise in price since the notice of them in the Doctor, &c.; not to mention "their other differences about doctrine, those different *Orders of Religion* amongst them are neither better nor worse than so many sects and several castes of religion; only they have that advantage in managing their divisions, which we have not, to pack up their fanatics in convents and cloisters, and so bring them under some kind of rule and government<sup>1</sup>."

To any who are in doubt, and who are tempted to leave their own Mother Church, this is a matter for most serious consideration, inasmuch as, the step once taken, few, like Chillingworth, have the honesty to confess their error, but lead a life of sadness and disappointment. Apart from profaneness,

*"Pauci, quos æquus amavit  
Jupiter, aut ardens evexit ad sidera virtus  
Dts geniti potuere!"*

We need hardly call to our readers' minds how admirably Jewel has handled this point in the Apology,—

"Like as a scholar who doth closely gather  
Many huge volumes into a narrow space<sup>2</sup>!"

"Verum, ô Deus bone," are his commencing words, "quinam isti tandem sunt, qui dissentiones in nobis reprehendunt? An vero omnes isti inter se consentiunt! An singuli satis habent consti-

<sup>1</sup> See Sermons, p. 105, pt. ii. 6.

<sup>2</sup> The history of Chillingworth is one to which, in a note, we beg to refer our readers. His Treatise, "The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation," has very properly been reprinted.

<sup>3</sup> Phineas Fletcher's Purple Island.

tutum, quid sequantur? An inter illos nullæ unquam dissensiones, nullæ lites extiterunt! Cur ergo Scotistæ et Thomistæ, &c. &c.” Turn to the passage, good reader, as well as to the Defence of the Apology, vol. iv. p. 31; vol. v. p. 288.

V. With respect to such men as Mr. Newman going over to the ranks of the Papacy, this we must look upon as a sad fall and a perversion of the right—unless, as in poor Blanco White’s case, there be an over-raught and restless mind to contend with. But any how, in Henry Vth’s words to the Lord Scroop,

“Thy fall hath left a kind of blot  
To mark the full-fraught man, and but indued  
With some suspicion.”

As respects many others, however, what Brevint says in the Preface to his Saul and Samuel at Endor, is pretty much the case. “The truth is,” says he, “ignorant sinners run generally for shelter to Rome, as broken merchants do to the King’s Bench, with hope of being there secured against the ordinary courses of justice.” This, at least, will apply to such as do not seek mere notoriety, or are not intellectually weak. But our object in referring to this individual case is to express our opinion relative to fallers off. We do not now, and we did not at the first, suppose that Rome would gain many converts. A contest is at hand, and we must abide it, but we are hopeful as to the result. Take our opinion in the words of Bishop Croft’s Legacy, before referred to: “No man is such a stranger in our Jerusalem as not to know what is daily discoursed in all places. Many timorous zealots cannot hold in their fears; many insulting Papists cannot hold in their hopes, that Popery will again bear rule in this nation. For my own part, weighing things according to reason, I mean such a reason as God hath given me, I cannot see any great probability of it<sup>4</sup>.” Such surmises are not unfrequently to be traced to Papists themselves, whose “wish is father to the thought.” The words of the great historian of the Peloponnesian war are most applicable to the Romanist’s wishes, whilst they convey a caution to us. Τὸ δὲ πλεον βουλήσει κρίνοντες ἀσαφεῖ ἢ προνοία ἀσφαλεῖ, εἰωθότες οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὗ μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν, ἐλπίδι ἀπερισκέπτῳ διδόναι, ὃ δὲ μὴ προσίενται, λογισμῷ αὐτοκράτορι διωθεῖσθαι<sup>5</sup>. But, let us be upon our guard, and we need not fear.

VI. Once more, with respect to the trite objection as to the Errors of the Reformers and of the Reformation, we are not

<sup>4</sup> Ut supra, p. 68.

<sup>5</sup> Thucyd. lib. iv. c. 108.



careful to answer otherwise than in the words of the much-traduced Laud—often erring, but constant unto death—in his Conference with Fisher: “As for any error which might fall into this (or any other reformations), if any such can be found, then I say, and it is most true, reformation, especially in cases of religion, is so difficult a work, and subject to so many pretensions, that it is almost impossible but that the reformers should step too far or fall too short in some smaller things or other, which, in regard of the far greater benefit coming by the Reformation itself, may well be passed over and borne withal. But, if there have been any wilful and gross errors, not so much in opinion as in fact (sacrilege too often pretending to reform superstitions<sup>6</sup>), that is the crime of the Reformers, not of the Reformation; and they are long since gone to God to answer for it: to Whom I leave them<sup>7</sup>.”

VII. If any Irish Roman Catholics should do us the honour to read these pages, we request that they will peruse (at their leisure) the following four productions of that excellent man, George Berkeley, some time Bishop of Cloyne, in Ireland: “*A Word to the Wise; or, An Exhortation to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland;*” “*A Letter to the Roman Catholics of the Diocese of Cloyne, published in the late Rebellion, A.D. 1745;*” “*Maxims concerning Patriotism;*” and, “*The Querist.*” We have wondered that the wisdom of this good man has not been called forth before this, and made public. The evils that beset Ireland in his day were just the same as those which beset it now; and for many of these he proposed antidotes, some of which have been tried, and the sooner others are tried the better for the people and the land. Without referring to his many anticipations<sup>9</sup> of improvements already made, we give the following Queries of his, for his countrymen to chew.

No. xix. *Whether the bulk of our Irish natives are not kept from*

<sup>6</sup> For the term Reformation misapplied, the reader will do well to consult South. Amongst other many passages, that in vol. iv. p. 220 of his Sermons is none of the least remarkable. On “*further reformation,*” may be added vol. i. p. 203. Speaking of the Puritans, he says, elsewhere, they knew very well that there was “a conversion of lands as well as a conversion of unbelievers.” We have lost this reference. All will recollect the words of the Homilies, in the fourth part of the Sermon against wilful Rebellion: “Surely that which they falsely call *reformation* is indeed not only a defacing, or a *deformation*, but also an utter destruction of all commonwealth,” &c.—p. 534.

<sup>7</sup> Sect. 24. v. p. 128. Ed. Cardwell.

<sup>9</sup> Those who shall refer to these remarkable documents will find how he encouraged and improved cultivation in all sorts of grain, as well as the growth of *hemp and flax*, so suited to the country. With many points we may not agree, but no one can read Berkeley without admiring his heart and his intellect. What Christ-Church man forgets,

“To Berkeley every virtue under heaven !”

*thriving, by that cynical content in dirt and beggary, which they possess to a degree beyond any other people in Christendom?*

No. cxix. *Whether it be possible the country should be well improved, while our beef is exported, AND OUR LABOURERS LIVE UPON POTATOES?*

No. cclxxi. *Whether there be any country in Christendom more capable of improvement than Ireland?*

No. dxcv. *Whose fault is it if poor Ireland still continues poor?*

Such and the like were his Queries, who thus addressed a Word to the Wise: "Raise your voices, Reverend Sirs, exert your influence, show your authority over the multitude, by engaging them to the practice of an honest industry, a duty necessary to all, and required in all, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, whether Christians, Jews, or Pagans. Be so good, among other points, to find room for *this*, than which none is of more concern to the souls and bodies of your hearers, nor consequently deserves to be more amply or frequently insisted on." The concluding words are memorable: "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri.* But, in truth, I am no enemy to your persons, whatever I may think of your tracts. On the contrary, I am your sincere well-wisher. I consider you as my countrymen, as fellow-subjects, as professing belief in the same Christ. And I do most sincerely wish there was no other contest between us but, *who shall most completely practise the precepts of Him by whose name we are called, and whose disciples we all profess to be*<sup>1</sup>."

Imperfect hints, and links, and affinities, all these; but, if we mistake not, they will give rise to sober thought and searchings of heart. In one and all we have not disguised our own sentiments, and we shall rejoice—none more—to find that we are prophets of ill; but, at the same time, we cannot disguise to ourselves the danger likely to accrue from concessions which avail not, or from truths

"Half told

Like story of Cambuscan old."

Look where we will—press our inquiries where we may,—there is a general and a vivid impression—(it has even been hinted to exist in the Odd Fellows' Societies)—that the emissaries of the staid old soldier of Pampluna are at work—that the ashes of dullness are again blown off from the torch of Ignatius Loyola.

"Who with a rabblement of his heretics

Blinds Europe's eyes, and troubleth our estate<sup>2</sup>."

<sup>1</sup> The passages will be found in pp. 120. 131. vol. i. ed. 8vo, 1820.

<sup>2</sup> Marlowe, Massacre of Paris. By the by we must not forget that there is such a thing as an ANTIPAPIST JESUIT! Let the reader consult Antony Faringdon's Sermons, vol. ii. 1108, folio.

And if we speak in accordance with our fears (even although, as we said, we do not anticipate any great falling off), yet we have a good hope of numbers of Roman Catholics; and, even if they despair of us as heretics<sup>3</sup>, "Heaven's gates" (as Laud said) "were not so easily shut against multitudes, when St. Peter wore the keys at his own girdle." Individually, and speaking for ourselves, one of the very best men we ever knew,—an Irish merchant in a northern capital,—was a Roman Catholic. Despite the sinfulness of our nature—"nonnulli (they are Cicero's words) *sive felicitate quiddam, sive bonitate naturæ, sive parentum disciplinæ rectam viam secuti sunt viam*<sup>4</sup>;" and so was it with this good man,—still living to bless those around him. His heart was always open, and his purse was never shut. It is hardly likely that we shall meet again on this side the grave; but there is room enough beyond, and then we shall all find that there is but one real Purgatory,—that is, Christ's blood shed to wash all penitent sinners clean. In the words of the Third Part of the Homily concerning Prayer, in the second tome revised by Jewel, "the only Purgatory, wherein we must trust to be saved, is the death and blood of Christ, which, if we apprehend with a true and stedfast faith, it purgeth and cleanseth us from all our sins, even as well as if He were now hanging upon the cross."

But enough. And, lest it might seem that we have forgotten that Jewel's Works are before us, we conclude with the two extracts following, the one and the other from "A View of a Seditious Bull."

"As Pope Pius complaineth now of the counsellors of England, so did the wolf some time make complaint to the shepherd against the dogs. 'Thou hast two vile ill-favoured curs, they jet up and down, they bark and howl, and trouble the flock, which cannot be quiet nor feed for them. Remove them away, tie them up, brain them, hang them, what do they here? The shepherd answered, 'Would you so? Nay, I may not spare my dogs, they do me good service. Spaniels and greyhounds are fair and dainty, yet they never do me so much good: these watch when I sleep, they ease me of much pain, and save my flock. If I should tie them up, thou wouldest be bold with me, and take thy pleasure.' I shall not need to apply this. The Queen's Majesty is our shepherd, we are left by God to her safe keeping. The faithful counsellors are like the watchful mastiffs, they take pains, they ease our shepherd, they save the flock. Now you may soon judge

<sup>3</sup> See Donne's Serm. x. on the Purification, p. 101, folio.

<sup>4</sup> We willingly adopt the words of Abp. Sumner from the conclusion of his Exposition, which has just reached us, "Undoubtedly the inward belief of many of them is purer than the articles of their Creed, and their practice governed by the real law of God, uncorrupted in things essential by the traditions of men which render it of none effect." 2 Thess. ii. 1—4. p. 84, 8vo.



who is the wolf. If Pope Pius could place his pilot in our ship, he would make us arrive at what port he listed."—vol. vii. p. 261.

"And Thou, O most merciful Father, be our defence in these dangerous times. The lion rangeth, and seeketh whom he may devour. Look down from Thy heavens upon us. Give Thy grace unto Elizabeth (VICTORIA) Thy servant. Thou hast placed her in the seat of her fathers: Thou hast made her to be a comfort unto the people: Thou hast endued her with manifold gifts: shadow her under the wings of Thy merciful protection: confound and bring to nothing the counsel of her enemies: direct the work of Thine own hand: establish that, O God, which Thou hast wrought in us: so we, which be Thy people, and the sheep of Thy pasture, shall give Thee honour and praise for ever and ever. Amen."—Ibid. p. 284.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since this Article was written, the fears and the warnings in it have, sooner than expected, become painful realities<sup>5</sup>. The Bull has gone forth, and England, Protestant England, is not acknowledged as among *the Faithful*; but, on the contrary, as heretical, and in need of conversion. Unchanged and unchangeable is the Church of Rome. Otherwise it cannot be, as long as it abides by its principles!

Meanwhile, if, as some even of their own selves confess, the mine has been sprung too soon, let us be none the less on our guard. As far as they go, and for as much as they are worth, we receive Lord Beaumont's, and we receive the Duke of Norfolk's letter; but, cautiously worded as they are, they do not persuade us that ultramontane notions will not be broached and maintained wherever it is possible they may be. What a clever Jesuist said the other day,—irritated with the vanity and the blatant ambition of Cardinal Wiseman<sup>6</sup>, and possibly not unaccompanied with some personal dislike,—only shows us which way the wind blows,—“HIS CONDUCT HAS THROWN US BACK A HUNDRED YEARS!” The hope and the intent are all one as they ever were, and Roman Catholic ascendancy is uppermost in their minds when they write or speak in terms the softest. Many forms, doubtless, there are of Antichrist<sup>7</sup>; and every man, as

<sup>5</sup> Will the Government now take any effectual step *retrogressive*?—not of the first grand error—the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*—of Catholic Emancipation,—but of the confirmed series of dangerous concessions they have ever since been stringing to the KITE'S TAIL?

<sup>6</sup> It was an old received opinion, that the Pope *shut the mouth* of a new Cardinal. He forgot to shut Dr. Wiseman's!

<sup>7</sup> If our memory serves us right, the Pope is only once called Antichrist in our Homilies,—viz. in the *Third Part of the Sermon of Obedience*. “He ought, therefore, rather to be called Antichrist, and the successor of the Scribes and Pharisees, than Christ's Vicar, or St. Peter's successor; seeing, that not only on this point, but also on other weighty matters of Christian religion, in matters of remission and forgiveness of sins, and of salvation, he teacheth so directly against St. Peter, and

Gauden says in the Hieraspistes, "hath cause to suspect *Anti-christ in his own bosom*"—but the pushing horn of the Vatican cannot but call to men's mind the insolence of the Seven Hills in former days, and, as they dwell upon these things, they are apt to draw a conclusion from proceedings before their eyes, and to think within themselves, "What has been may be again!"

It only remains that we tender our best thanks to Dr. Jelf for his ready courtesy in offering us his corrections to the "List of Authors and Editors," provided we could wait till he could gather them together. Unluckily, it is too late to stay the press, and we are only able to insert the following. What it relates to, will be found in vol. vi. 295. Defence of Apol. part vi. chap. 7. divis. 2. "BEMB. CARDINAL. Epistles written in the name and by the authority of Leo X. Jewel's reference is to a Letter addressed to Charles V.—It should be 'ad Recanatenses.' [Epist. lib. viii. *Cal. Julias anno secundo.*] Jewel's statement as to the Virgin Mary being called Dea is quite correct."

We do not know at present that we can refer to any other sources where information is likely to be found on this head,—one only excepted, which is the "*Irish Literary Gazette*" for July and August, 1848, in which the Rev. R. Gibbings has supplied several desiderata.

against our Saviour Christ, who not only taught obedience to kings, but also practised obedience in their conversation and living."—p. 114. Ed. Clar. 8vo. 1822.

---

- ART. VI.—1. *An Appeal to the Reason and Good Feeling of the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy.* By CARDINAL WISEMAN. London: Thomas Richardson and Son.
2. *The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the New Hierarchy.* By GEORGE BOWYER, Esq., D.C.L., Barrister at Law &c. *By Authority.* London: Ridgway.
3. *Diotrephes and St. John; on the Claim set up by the Bishop of Rome to exercise Jurisdiction in England and Wales, by erecting therein Episcopal Sees.* No. IX. of *Occasional Sermons.* By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. London: Rivingtons.
4. *The Bull of Pope Pius the Ninth, and the Ancient British Church. A Letter.* By E. C. HARRINGTON, M.A., Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of Exeter. London: Rivingtons.

WHEN Her Gracious Majesty was induced a year or two since to express Her sympathy with the Pope in his distresses, and when Her Majesty's Ministers lent the aid of the Crown to replace the Pontiff on his throne, and to crush the liberties of the Roman people, it was little anticipated that acts of such high favour—acts indicative of such very cordial and amicable feeling towards the see of Rome—would be so ill repaid as they have been within the last few months. The *first* return of the papacy for the support extended to it by the Crown of England, was the condemnation of that favourite plan of the Government and of the leading political parties—the royal colleges established in Ireland, and bearing the “Queen’s” name. The *second* is the division of all England into archiepiscopal and episcopal sees, and the appointment of bishops by the Papal authority. What will the *third* be? We suppose it will be to absolve all Romish subjects of the British Crown from their allegiance to a heretical prince. But matters are not quite ripe for *that* step at present. What has occurred, however, was exactly what might have been expected by those who are acquainted with the spirit and policy of the papacy and of its adherents. It appears to have come quite by surprise on the Government, and yet the design of establishing a Romish hierarchy, and, in particular, an Archbishop of Westminster, had been publicly known for several years. We have ourselves called attention to the scheme, and have urged that



changes should be made in our own hierarchy, in order to meet the coming evil. There was no attempt on the part of Romanists to conceal the design, as Dr. Wiseman has observed with perfect correctness in his Appeal. We can ourselves bear witness to the truth of his statements on this point.

In September, 1847, we spoke thus in reference to the intentions of Romanism in this country.

“It seems to us that the present crisis is of the highest importance to the Church, and that on the judicious and active management of her affairs at this time very great results are dependent. There are great questions affecting her, which are likely to engage the attention of the public ere long, and we earnestly trust that apathy, or fancied security, or a mistimed feeling of dignity, may not prevent the adoption of efforts commensurate to the occasion. The apparently divided state of the Church (we trust that division will not prevent the co-operation of Churchmen for the welfare of the Church generally); the attacks in Parliament on the Ecclesiastical Commission; the virulent radical opposition to the increase of the episcopate; the exertions of sectarians to extend their own system, and to prevent the extension of the Church; the important questions involved in the Bishopric of Manchester Bill; are charged with important results on the welfare of the Church herself.

“That the Church of England has possessed a vantage-ground over her opponents, in the possession of the episcopal sees of her ancient hierarchy, has long been felt by both friends and foes. It is something to have to contrast the succession of archbishops in the episcopal chairs of St. Augustine and St. Paulinus, with the strange and foreign titles of Romish ‘Vicars Apostolic;’ and what authority bishops of ‘Debra,’ or ‘Chalcis,’ or ‘Melipotamus,’ can claim in England, is not very evident. This is a contrast which has been long and keenly felt by many of the English Romanists; and many have been the ineffectual efforts which they have made to induce the see of Rome to substitute bishops and archbishops possessed of the titles of the English hierarchy, for the system of ‘Vicars Apostolic,’ who derive their jurisdiction so entirely from the Pope, that they might at any moment be deposed by simply withdrawing the Papal licence under which they act. But, though such attempts have hitherto been unsuccessful, for some secret reasons, we should think the time cannot be very far distant, in which we shall see a rival hierarchy in England, usurping the titles of English sees. The appointments of Romish archbishops and bishops in the colonies, with titles derived from the countries in which they are settled, seems an indication of what is likely to be effected in England itself before long. Of course, such a step will not in reality alter the position of the respective parties, and the very novelty of the Romish hierarchy will, for a long time, be successfully pleaded against its claims; but we must be prepared for the annoyances which would, in various ways, result from the usurpation of the titles of English

bishoprics by Romanists. If report speaks true, very great efforts are now being made, with the object of introducing this innovation." English Review, No. xv. p. 146, 147.

On the same occasion we urged that the see of London should be made an archbishopric, in order that the head of the Church in the Metropolis might not be inferior in ecclesiastical rank to his Romish opponent and rival.

"We would strongly urge, that in any plan for Church extension the Crown should be given the power of raising bishoprics to the title and rank of archbishoprics. If this be not done, the effect will be, that in a short time we shall find Romish ecclesiastics holding the title of *archbishop*, in positions where the head of our Church bears an *inferior title*. The effects of this will, we are convinced, be *most injurious* to the Church. We feel confident of the truth of this, from having observed the effect of such apparent superiority in the colonies and in Ireland. The Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, who hold the rank of *protothrones* (to speak ecclesiastically), ought, in our opinion, at once to become archbishops, holding their present temporal rank and precedence. The same rank ought, without any loss of time, to be given to the Bishops of Calcutta, Sydney, Jamaica, and Montreal. Will it be for the benefit of the Church to see a Romish '*archbishop*' of London or Westminster, while the Bishop of London is possessed of an inferior title? We think that this inconvenience might be obviated, by introducing a provision into any measure of Church extension now to be brought forward. In a few years hence it might be unattainable, especially if proposed as a separate measure."—p. 174.

At the same time we directed attention to the means for increasing episcopal superintendence, and suggested that sees should be founded, amongst other places, at *Plymouth, Shrewsbury, Westminster, Birmingham, Liverpool, Hexham, and Beverley*. So that we have seen with regret the Church of Rome taking possession of these and other important titles of sees, which ought long since to have been appropriated by the Church of England. We claim no credit for foresight in expecting that the Church of Rome would soon place her hierarchy in a more imposing position in England.

The design of creating a Romish hierarchy was publicly known in 1847. It was, also, as it appears from Dr. Wiseman's statement, communicated to Lord Minto in 1848, when that diplomatist was at Rome. And, moreover, Her Majesty's Government had witnessed with perfect equanimity, not merely the continuance of the Romish hierarchy in Ireland, though day by day assuming more and more openly the style and titles attributed by law only to the archbishops and bishops of the established Church; but even the conversion, throughout all the

colonies and dependencies of England, of vicars-apostolic into territorial bishops. Not a remonstrance was ever heard from the Government on the point; nay, these very archbishops and bishops, assuming territorial titles, were officially recognized in their respective ranks; and Romish archbishops nominated by the Pope were given precedence over bishops of the Church, nominated by the Queen. Lord Stanley offered no objection to the establishment of a Romish territorial hierarchy in North America when consulted by Dr. Wiseman in 1841. Lord Grey has followed up the same liberal policy. Now the Supremacy of the Crown is precisely the same in Ireland and in the colonies as it is in England. Whatever is an invasion of the ecclesiastical rights of the Crown in England is equally an invasion of those rights, if attempted in Ireland or in any of the dependencies of the British Crown. If a Romish territorial hierarchy in England be inconsistent with the rights of the Crown, it is exactly as much inconsistent in Ireland, and in North America, and in Australia, and in the West Indies, and elsewhere. If, then, the present aggression of Rome be a just cause for "indignation" to Her Majesty's Ministers, what are we to say of those ministers themselves who have permitted the royal prerogatives to be infringed in the same manner, or even in a more openly illegal way, for a series of years?

The fact is this—that successive Governments have been for a great length of time permitting the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown to be infringed on by the papacy. The Government takes offence at the last step, having virtually sanctioned every other. And what has led to this exhibition of zeal on the present occasion?

If we may be permitted to hazard a conjecture, we should say, that the tone of the English ministry would have been very different on this occasion, and consequently the tone of their party and of its press, had not the *Irish colleges* been formally condemned by the Romish Synod of Thurles, in obedience to the Pope's rescript, only a few weeks before. The moment that this decision was made known, the "Times," and all the ministerial and liberal press, altered their tone in regard to Romanism. The course taken by the Pope, and the Romish National Synod at Thurles, was indeed as offensive to the Government as it could possibly be. A plan carried through Parliament in open opposition to the wishes of the people of England, and put in operation at great cost, and with every circumstance which could give it dignity and weight—a system which was thus carefully, and anxiously, and perseveringly set up for the express purpose of gratifying the Romanists of Ireland—was destined to find the strongest opposition from the



very community it was intended to serve ; and this, too, after the Government had been instrumental in greatly augmenting the endowment for Maynooth, without attempting to shackle its grant by any conditions, and in defiance of the universal and indignant remonstrances of the English people. The Maynooth grant was forced on by the Ministers of the Crown, in opposition to the people. The “godless” colleges were carried in the same way. But as soon as ever the buildings were erected, and the long array of presidents, and principals, and wardens, and professors, and other officials were nominated, and in possession of their respective emoluments, and these institutions had been opened with every kind of pomp and ceremony, the Pope and the Romish bishops came to the resolution, that no member of their communion should enter these “irreligious” institutions ; and that a “Catholic” university should be established in opposition to them ! Now this was undoubtedly the severest provocation that could well be offered to the Government. It was not merely to reject a proffered favour, but it was to reject it under such circumstances as made the proceeding of the Government look perfectly absurd and ridiculous. The Queen’s name had been bestowed on stately buildings, where no pupils except Protestants were to be permitted to enter ; and these “liberal” colleges were finally destined to dwindle from the lofty position of national establishments, for the education of the whole people, into mere “Protestant” seminaries—and this, too, when Trinity College, Dublin, and the Belfast Institution, were amply sufficient for the instruction of all the Churchmen and Presbyterians who required a collegiate education ! Nothing could be more absurd than the position in which the Government was thus placed by the decrees of the papacy and of the synod of Thurles ; and though little has been said on this painful subject, except by the Government press, we cannot but suppose that the insult has been keenly felt, and bitterly resented in secret ; and certain it is, that the “liberal” mind was grievously discomposed by the conduct of the Pope in this matter, when the bull founding English dioceses came to blow their discontent into a flame.

We do not remember that any portion of the public press, however, took notice of the fact, that the whole circumstances attending the Romish Synod of Thurles, were quite as palpable an infringement of the Royal Supremacy, as the bull appointing English sees. The Supremacy exists in Ireland just as much as it does in England. How comes it then, that without the slightest remonstrance or expression of dissatisfaction, the Pope’s bull or rescript was published, authorizing the assembling of that council, when it is a well-known branch of the Royal Supremacy

to summon synods ; and all persons assembling such synods, and making canons in them without the royal assent, are subject to the penalties of premunire? It is generally supposed that synods cannot be assembled without the royal licence ; but yet, in defiance of this law, a national synod was openly and ostentatiously celebrated, with the full knowledge of Government, and canons were enacted, and the persons attending it assumed in the most public way the rank of territorial archbishops and bishops, and were recognized as such, in opposition to the archbishops and bishops appointed by the Queen. In the whole of this transaction, the Queen's Supremacy was ignored, and the Papal Supremacy was substituted in its place. And yet, not a voice was raised by any one against this flagrant usurpation of the papacy—this insult to the Crown. We confess our satisfaction that a Government which has connived at so public a violation of the Royal Supremacy in Ireland, should in a few weeks afterwards object to its violation in England. If the ministers take steps to punish the erection of new bishoprics without the Queen's leave, they are certainly bound equally to punish those who have assembled and celebrated national synods without the Queen's leave.

A new light seems to have opened upon the whole subject of the Royal Supremacy just now. The ministers and the people of England have suddenly discovered that the appointment of territorial bishops of any communion, without the Queen's consent, is an infringement of the Supremacy of the Crown. Undoubtedly it is so, according to the views taken of the Supremacy of Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, and by all our sovereigns till within the last century. When the Oath of Supremacy was instituted by Henry VIII., and revived by Queen Elizabeth, the declaration that the sovereign was supreme in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things and causes, meant, unquestionably, that every subject of the British Crown was bound to submit to that Supremacy, and that no regulations on religious subjects could be made without the sovereign's consent. The declaration that no foreign prelate or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction within this realm, was intended to exclude especially the Papal power, to deny its existence as an authority, to refuse to recognize it as in any way existing over the subjects of the English Crown, whether in England or in any of its dependencies. The sovereigns who imposed this oath did not intend to permit the existence of the Papal jurisdiction at all in this kingdom. And such undoubtedly was the intention even of the Parliament of King William, which omitted the positive part of the Oath of Supremacy, and only retained its declaration against foreign jurisdiction. Its intention was unquestionably the same as that of the Parliaments of Henry

VIII. and Elizabeth, to oblige those who took it to deny the existence of any Papal jurisdiction in England; to refuse to recognize it as a power holding authority over all or any of the subjects of the English Crown.

Such was the old and genuine view of the Royal Supremacy: it was a power which was supposed to be inherent in the Crown, to be co-extensive with the nation, to be based on Scripture, and to be supported by the practice of Christian emperors. It authorized the sovereign to convene synods, to repress all schisms and heresies, to keep every subject of the Crown in obedience to the true religion maintained and established by the Crown. All persons who refused to adhere to the national faith and worship were regarded and treated as criminals. The attempt to establish any jurisdiction, or worship, or religious organization, whether Romish or Puritan, was repressed by the strong arm of the law. Every one was liable to be called on to take the Oath of Supremacy; so that the Supremacy was held to extend to *every subject* of the English Crown. All this was perfectly consistent and intelligible.

And such clearly is, to a considerable extent, the view taken of the Royal Supremacy by the mass of the people at this moment, and in general by all the opponents of the recent measure of Pius IX. They all regard it as an invasion of the Royal Supremacy. From the Sovereign on her throne down to the poorest of her subjects, all concur in repudiating this attempt as an invasion of the Royal Supremacy. It has been in vain for dissenters to protest, as they have done at a few public meetings, that they could not join in asserting the Royal Supremacy in opposition to the Papal. They have been hooted down, or hustled; and the whole people have declared that the Royal Supremacy must be maintained against the Papal usurpation. Now what is the meaning of this? Its meaning is that Romanists are, in their capacity of British subjects, bound to submit to the Queen's Supremacy; that the Supremacy extends its jurisdiction over *all* her Majesty's subjects. Certainly there cannot be a sounder or more correct principle than this. If the ecclesiastical Supremacy be an attribute of the Crown, it extends wherever the authority of the Crown extends, and over all the subjects of the Crown. Whatever may be the religious tenets of any man, whether he be Romanist, or Churchman, or dissenter, or Presbyterian, he is equally subject to the ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown.

Mr. Bowyer and Dr. Wiseman argue, in their respective pamphlets, that the State, in granting emancipation to Romanists, intended to grant them full permission to deny the Supremacy of



the Crown, and that they are accordingly wholly free from that Supremacy, and only subject to the Papal Supremacy. The Roman Catholic Oath in the Emancipation Act being so constructed as to require only a rejection of the doctrine that the Pope has any "temporal or civil" jurisdiction in this realm, Mr. Bowyer infers that it was intended to leave Roman Catholics at liberty to hold that the see of Rome has "spiritual" jurisdiction in the dominions of the British Crown. Dr. Wiseman adds, that by these Acts "Catholics" were freed from all obligation of acknowledging the Royal ecclesiastical Supremacy, and that the Supremacy is not admitted by any dissenters—that, in fact, the Supremacy is limited strictly to the Church of England—that any one can cease to be subject to the Royal Supremacy by merely separating from the Church. And he quotes Lord Lyndhurst to show that as "Catholics" may, without being liable to punishment by the common law, assert the Papal Supremacy, so they may equally deny the Royal Supremacy.

But Dr. Wiseman's own authority here fails him most sadly; for it so happens, that, in respect to the last point, Lord Lyndhurst, as quoted by Dr. Wiseman, says precisely the contrary; his words are these:—

"On the other hand, if any person improperly, wantonly, or seditiously, called in question the Supremacy of the Crown of England—and *that*, it was to be observed, included the temporal as well as the *spiritual power of the Crown*—if any, from any improper motive or purpose, or in any improper manner, questioned *that* Supremacy, then that person would be liable to a prosecution at the common law; and there could be no doubt, if the learned judges were consulted, they would so determine."—p. 12.

Here is exactly the highest authority for the assertion that the Queen's Supremacy *still* extends to every subject of the Crown. Lord Lyndhurst admits indeed that a Romanist may hold the Papal Supremacy; but he must not dare to deny the *Queen's* Supremacy. He is left to reconcile the two Supremacies in the best way he can; but the Royal Supremacy over him in ecclesiastical matters is fully asserted, and if he pretends to *deny* that Supremacy on any account—even on account of his duty to the Pope—he is liable to punishment at common law, and all the judges would affirm that he is so!

And is it not obvious that it must be so? The Queen is supreme in ecclesiastical and spiritual matters by common and statute law. Certain classes of British subjects, holding peculiar religious views, were for a long time held to be traitors or evil-doers, for disobedience to the Royal Supremacy. They were at length tolerated, relieved, and emancipated from the various

pains, penalties, and disabilities inflicted on them by law. The oaths and declarations were modified to meet their case, and permit them to exercise the peculiar religions they had chosen. But *in no one instance* was the Royal Supremacy ever brought into question by any legislative act. It may have been practically compromised, by not being enforced, or being permitted to lie dormant; but in no act of relief, toleration, or emancipation has the Crown ever conceded to any body of men the right of denying its Supremacy. The law may not be so enforced as to require every one to profess that Supremacy; it may wink at much that is going on; it may reserve the assertion of rights for special occasions: but it is evident that at this moment the Crown holds in theory, and according to all the principles of the law and constitution, the same ecclesiastical Supremacy over every subject of the Crown that it did in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Dr. Wiseman must not suppose that every thing which is tolerated is legal. The Crown has as little relinquished its ecclesiastical Supremacy over Dr. Wiseman himself, as the Pope has relinquished his temporal Supremacy over the Queen of England. Neither power is enforced, and neither power is relinquished. Dr. Wiseman may deny, as much as he pleases, the ecclesiastical Supremacy of the Crown of England over himself and other Romanists within this empire; but his and their denial will not in the least change the state of the law, or divest the Crown of the powers which constitutionally belong to it.

To suppose, indeed, as he does, that any man who pleases to walk across the street from the parish church, to Salem or Ebenezer, or the popish chapel, can, by that easy and simple process, free himself, not merely from any necessity of professing belief in the Royal Supremacy, but from all *subjection to that Supremacy in the eye of the law*, is certainly a strange supposition; and, in order to reconcile us to the notion that the Supremacy is placed in so precarious, nay, so ridiculous a position by law, something more than mere logical inferences from certain Acts of Parliament ought to be forthcoming.

We beg leave, therefore, to assure Dr. Wiseman, and his co-religionists in England and Ireland, that they are at this moment in the eye of the law just as much subject to the Royal ecclesiastical Supremacy, whatever they may say, as members of the Church of England are. The only difference is, that toleration is extended, and liberty conceded to Romanists, which is not in the same way requisite for Churchmen, who are obedient to authority. Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Wesleyans, and dissenters of all kinds, are all equally by law subject to the Royal Supremacy. The Supremacy has never been relinquished

by law in the case of any sect. Not a statute can be pointed out which states that Romanists, or any other religious denomination, are exempted from the Royal Supremacy.

This is not the view generally taken; but we feel convinced, by all we have lately seen and heard, that it is the true view. Of course, if the Queen's ecclesiastical Supremacy does not extend over the whole nation, the recent appointment of Bishops by the Pope is no violation of the Supremacy. If the law exempts Romanists from the Royal Supremacy, the Pope may do what he likes with reference to their affairs. But the whole nation is convinced that there has been a direct infringement on the Royal Supremacy.

The results of the step taken by Pius IX. cannot fail to be of very great importance in various ways. In the first place, the Prime Minister of the Crown has expressed himself in such indignant terms, as to have held out to the people of England an expectation that the temporal power will be employed to repress the attempt which has been made by the Pope. Every one appears to expect that legislation will take place with a view to such cases. On the other hand, to attempt, either by enforcing the laws, or by enacting new ones, to put down the recent proceedings of Pope Pius, would give mortal offence to the adherents of the papacy. Nor is the influence of that party to be despised by the present Government. Sixty or seventy Irish votes might not be able to prevent the passing of measures against the Romish hierarchy; but they would be able to turn out the ministry, by siding with the Conservatives in the next division; and such will probably be their policy. They will never permit an insult to their hierarchy: they will tell the minister that their votes depend on his conduct in this matter; and he will succumb. We can scarcely persuade ourselves that any legislation can take place on this subject, or that the Government will take any steps against the new Romish hierarchy. To do so would be to reverse the policy which for many years has influenced this country. It would be to maintain the ancient institutions of this nation—to protect the Church of England—to uphold the Royal Prerogative against Papal aggression—to run the risk of displeasing the Romanists of the United Kingdom. We shall not believe this possible, until we have been convinced by the evidence of positive facts. Whatever may be the excitement of the people, we can scarcely expect that it will induce a “Liberal” House of Commons to alter its policy. That policy is no innovation: it has presided in the councils of successive Governments for thirty years. From the moment that George IV. was advised by his minister to receive the Romish hierarchy officially and publicly in



1821, on occasion of his visit to Ireland, an uninterrupted series of concessions has manifested the wish of each successive Government to gratify the Romanists in Ireland and in England. Political parties have for several years vied with each other in bidding for the good will of the Romish interest. Sir Robert Peel and his friends were as anxious as Lord John Russell and his to subsidize the Romish priesthood of Ireland, by granting them glebes, and houses, and payments from the Treasury; and that this has not been done has arisen solely from the obstinate refusal of the Romish priesthood and hierarchy. Dr. Wiseman has proved, and unanswerably, in his Appeal, that for a long series of years the Church of Rome has been encouraged by the Governments of England, in its successive movements and aggressions. We cannot conceive that this policy is now about to be reversed.

But, if it be not reversed—if the Romish hierarchy be left substantially in the occupation of the position it has taken—what will be the position of the Church of England? We put out of sight the mere denial of her character, and authority, and even existence, by the recent measures, but we look to their practical bearing. Will not the people, then, be confused and disturbed by finding a rival hierarchy claiming their adhesion? Nay, in places where none of our bishops are placed, will not the Romish bishop be recognized gradually as “the bishop” of the place? At Birmingham a Romish ecclesiastic will be the only “bishop” known in the place. So again at Liverpool, in Southwark, Plymouth, Northampton, and other important places where we have no bishops. Those places will virtually be handed over to the Church of Rome to assume there the position of the regular episcopate. Our people will, we fear, be greatly confused by all this.

And, moreover, the rank and station now assumed by Romish ecclesiastics will operate most injuriously in giving to them influence over weak-minded persons, who may be caught and attracted by high-sounding titles, and the show of a hierarchy surrounded with all those formalities which Romanism knows so well how to avail itself of. And this is but the first step. The next will be to summon a national synod with as much pomp as can be assigned to it, and to carry out the organization by nominating deans, archdeacons, canons, vicars-general, chancellors, precentors, and rectors and vicars. Every incumbent of a parish in England, in which there is a Romish priest, will very soon find himself confronted by a rival rector or vicar who will treat him as an usurper, and hold himself entitled by all the laws of God and of holy Church to the churches, and tithes, and lands of that benefice.

It is vain to conceal from ourselves that all this would place

the bishops and clergy of England in a position they have never occupied before. At every turn they would be met by rivals.

Now all this will be positively and seriously injurious to the security of the Church of England. Every one sees the dangers arising from a Romish hierarchy in Ireland: dangers the same in kind, though not in degree, as yet, will follow from a similar proceeding in England. The rights of the Church will be endangered: and her position lowered; and advantages will have been conceded to her rivals to exert all their powers for her subversion. The Crown will, if it permit this invasion of the rights of the national Church, have consented to allow her opponents, without let or impediment, to take every step within their power, to adopt the most perfect and systematic organization, for the exact purpose of destroying the Church of England.

How it would be possible to reconcile such a course of proceeding as this with the engagements of the Crown, to protect the faith and the rights of the Church of England—engagements imposed by oath on the sovereign by the very same authority, which requires from the subject the oath of Supremacy; how the Crown can be considered to discharge its part of the compact, and can call on others to respect their part of the compact, if it permit the rights of the Church to be flagrantly violated, and the security of the Church and of its faith to be endangered as they are by the measure of Pius IX., we are unable to see. The Coronation oath is surely as binding on the sovereign, as the oath of Supremacy on the subject. That Coronation oath was, we think, really broken, when Roman Catholic emancipation was granted, notwithstanding the pretended securities by which it was accompanied. It has not been attended to, we fear, by successive ministers, who have advised the relinquishment of security after security for the Church, and the adoption of measure after measure in furtherance of the claims and objects of the Church's opponents, without even the pretence of further securities for the Church. But now a blow is aimed at the Church far more formidable than any that has yet taken effect; and if this blow is permitted to descend—if it is not warded off—if the Church of Rome is permitted to make its descent like a bird of prey upon us—we think the question must at once occur to every Churchman's mind: "Is the Crown of England keeping its engagements to the Church and the country?"

We can only see one way in which this question could be satisfactorily answered, supposing that the Crown were not prepared to recommend the repression—the effectual repression of this Romish outrage on the Church. If the Church of England, including bishops, clergy, and laity fairly represented

in synod, and subject to the Royal Supremacy, were permitted to take counsel together for the purpose of developing the internal resources of the Church, and completing her organization in opposition to the rival which has now started up, we should feel that something at least had been done in the way of giving securities to the Church. But to feel, that while we are unable to get a single additional bishopric, and while the cause of that difficulty is chiefly the presence of Roman Catholics and dissenters in Parliament, the Church of Rome is to be allowed to multiply her episcopate *three-fold* in ten years, with prospect of further increase, and to usurp positions which ought years ago to have been occupied by the national Church, would certainly impress the mind with a strong sense of grievance and wrong.

We are not, however, disposed to think that any steps for the security of the Church of England are likely to be taken at present. The excitement of the public mind has been directed by Lord John Russell with considerable adroitness to the Tractarian doctrines and practices as the sole cause of the recent Papal aggression. The unpopularity of these tenets rendered it an easy task to effect this diversion of the popular fury, which might otherwise have burst upon the course of state policy to which the advocates of the Papal proceedings have appealed in their justification. The Evangelical party have eagerly taken the opportunity of assailing their opponents in every way. How far this course may be pursued when Parliament meets remains to be seen. There are parties in the legislature who will not be disposed to let the question be shifted from its true grounds. We may expect indeed that Tractarianism will be severely condemned in Parliament, nor shall we be much surprised even to see measures taken for its suppression, if such can be devised. But we can scarcely suppose that, even if such measures be introduced, the Parliament of England would be prepared to sweep every "High-Church" incumbent out of the Church, and to leave none remaining except those who adopt the Calvinistic view of regeneration.

There has been considerable dissatisfaction on the subject of the Royal Supremacy for some years past. Let the Supremacy, however, be fairly and *bonâ fide* exercised in the spirit of the engagements which it involves, and which the Sovereign undertakes by oath at his coronation, and all difficulties will be at an end. If the Supremacy be religiously exercised—if it be exercised in the spirit of the godly kings and Christian emperors of old, or of our own Edwards and Elizabeths, then it will be an unspeakable blessing to the country.

If the State should now honestly, consistently, and *bonâ fide*



adopt the policy of protecting the Church and the Royal Supremacy in this empire, by repressing the recent attempt of the Papacy, and taking all steps within its power for withdrawing the recognition it has extended to the Papal jurisdiction at home and in the Colonies—if this should be the course adopted, our advice to all faithful Churchmen would be to co-operate cordially and earnestly with any Government which thus acted up to the responsibilities incumbent on it, and to refrain from the expression of any sentiments of distrust, or of opposition, which might have the effect of diminishing the unanimity of a movement possessing many and great claims on their approbation.

We are aware that there are some circumstances in the movement which we have seen which are calculated to cause uneasiness in the minds of good Churchmen. Principles have been not unfrequently broached at public meetings which would, if fairly carried into effect, amount to the overthrow of the Church of England. Men, in their indignation at the dangerous tenets of Rome, and the follies and apostasies of some among ourselves, have sometimes spoken in such terms as are not consistent with a knowledge of the principles of their own Church, or with faithfulness to her. But it must be observed, that in such public meetings persons of all creeds and denominations were present, and took part in the proceedings; and this naturally led to the expression of sentiments, in many instances, inconsistent with the right tone and spirit of members of the Church of England.

These meetings have, however, been valuable in one respect. They have distinctly proved what the feeling amongst the overwhelming mass of the people of England is in reference to "Tractarianism." We think it is most highly desirable that the extent of this feeling should be fully and distinctly understood. That it has not been appreciated by those against whom this movement has been chiefly directed is quite certain. Had they understood it, they would not have entertained any hopes of introducing alterations in the laws relating to the alliance of Church and State, by any efforts which they themselves could make, or in which they were prominent leaders. The state of the public mind has now been so unequivocally manifested that there can be no longer any mistake on the subject. The general hostility to "Tractarianism" is extreme; understanding chiefly by that name approximations to Romish ritual, and doctrine, and practice, exemplified in an attention to symbolism, mediæval arrangements, and decorations of chancels; the use of lights, flowers, crucifixes, and rood-screens; the practice of systematic confessions, penances, and absolutions; of invocations of saints, and the use of rosaries and books of Romish devotion. And, through

the strong, and not unfounded hostility to the system which is thus distinguished, a very great difficulty is placed in the way of all those clergy who are desirous of promoting decency and propriety in public worship; of observing the directions of the Church, and of urging on their people the duty of remaining in its communion, and not frequenting dissenting places of worship, or allowing their children to be brought up as Dissenters. The existing prejudice in the popular mind against "Puseyism," or "Tractarianism," leaves this very large portion of the Clergy, and even of the Episcopate, in a painful and disadvantageous position. It is in the power of any person to whom a faithful and conscientious clergyman may have given offence in the discharge of his duty, however unintentionally, to excite a prejudice against him by vague and unfounded charges of "Puseyism." It is in the power of Dissenters to set his flock against him by whisperings which perhaps never reach his ears, and which he has no means of effectually meeting and refuting. The Romanist will often insidiously claim him for his own, with the express purpose of sowing dissension in his flock. The present state of things, therefore, gives the enemies of the Church the most effectual means of undermining the usefulness of every man who is not remarkable for his association with dissenting teachers, or who does not occupy his hearers' time with pulpit denunciations of "Popery" and "Puseyism." A clergyman may exert himself in every way to guard his flock from Popish emissaries. He may refrain from every approximation to the Romish Ritual, and limit himself entirely to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer. He may deeply lament the practices which he hears of elsewhere, and may express his regret at the course which is being taken. He may be really opposed to "Tractarianism;" may have no intercourse with its leaders, or with any partizans; and yet this will not protect him from imputations as grossly unjust as they are painful and injurious. A clergyman may write and preach against the errors of Romanism, and yet even this will not exempt him from the suspicion of being a "Puseyite," and therefore a "Papist."

But the great evil arising from this is, that the ministerial usefulness of any clergyman is thus liable, without the slightest fault on his part, to be impaired, and the cause of the Church injured. It may be impossible for him conscientiously to accept the Calvinistic views which some of his brethren entertain, and perhaps, if he were to adopt them, his congregation would be highly dissatisfied. It may be impossible for him, acting on his view of duty, to introduce irregularities in the mode of performing Divine service, or to teach his people that it is a matter of indif-

ference whether they go to church or to meeting-house. Yet surely a clergyman ought not to be placed in the position of being considered as a traitor to his Church merely because he tries to do his duty according to the best of his knowledge and conscience, and adopts the course which has been recommended by all our great Divines in former ages. That men who are devotedly attached to the Church of England, and who have not the slightest leaning towards Romanism, but are ready on all occasions to resist its inroads, should be liable, as they are, to the most unfounded imputations, is a severe trial and hardship in itself; and, if the popular feeling should lead to the expulsion of such men from the Church of England, that Church will be no gainer by the result.

It seems to us far from improbable that we are on the eve of measures directed to the professed removal of Romanizing practices and tenets from the Church. Our reasons for so thinking are these. The excitement of the popular mind is so profound, and so unusually protracted, that it has even brought forward numbers of members of both houses of Parliament, men of the most "liberal" views in politics, to denounce at public meetings the twofold peril of "Popery" and "Puseyism." Now this is quite a new feature in the times. The agitation in 1829, and in the time of the Maynooth Bill, was extensive, but it was not participated in by all classes of the community, and by persons of all shades of politics and religion, as this has been. The "liberal" party is thus committed, not only by the act of Lord John Russell, but by its own participation in the agitation, to do *something* in the next session of Parliament. The people who have been thus excited cannot be put aside with mere words: something must be *done*, if the popularity which Lord John Russell has attained is to be preserved; if the popular feeling is to be prevented from turning into one of exasperation and disappointment.

It is therefore evident that something must be done: but, considering the political influence exercised in the House of Commons by the Romish party, and a certain body of "liberals" in connexion with them, we think it impossible that any measures of real repression of the recent papal aggression can be urged or even attempted. The alternative then will be, to gratify the popular mind by measures for the purpose of purging all Romanizing practices, forms, and ceremonies out of the Church. To do any thing effectual it might, perhaps, be necessary to go to Parliament for powers. We may very possibly, ere long, have royal injunctions, and a visitation to carry them into effect, as was the case in the time of Edward VI.



Now, if any such course should be adopted, we would express in the first place our earnest hope, that Churchmen would not be too hasty to take offence at what they may justly consider in some respects an evil ; for the interference of the temporal power in religious matters is not a novelty either in England or elsewhere ; and, when the interference is directed to right and lawful objects, the Church has frequently tolerated irregularities, and even derived benefit from them. The great point, therefore, for consideration ought to be the *substance* and *nature* of the reforms or alterations contemplated. In the event of any such measures being adopted, it would, most probably, be managed and directed by persons of the Evangelical and Latitudinarian schools. It would, therefore, be possible, that a course might be taken which would not merely repress Romanizing innovations, but might go further, and alter in some material points the discipline or doctrine of the Church of England. Now, the result would be this. If measures were taken, *bonâ fide*, for the repression of Romish practices and ceremonies, we should suppose that no material difficulties would arise. The great mass of the clergy who hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and are, therefore, unjustly called " Tractarians " and " Puseyites," have no wish to see any Romish practices or ceremonies introduced into the Church : they grieve to hear of such things being attempted ; and they would not be found amongst the advocates of those who may have indiscreetly or improperly introduced them. The only ground on which they might be led to oppose themselves to such a process of reform as we have referred to would be unwillingness to recognise a power which might be capable of gross abuse, and might be hereafter employed for the subversion of the faith as held by the Church of England. This would be, probably, the ground also taken by the advocates of Romish practices and tenets, who would trust to it as a means of exciting feeling in their behalf, which would never be called forth by any mere defence of Romanizing practices. Such is the strong feeling of dislike of the interference of a State which includes persons of all religious creeds in the spiritual concerns of the Church, that we can well imagine that various persons might be led to identify themselves with the small Romanizing faction, in support of what they did not themselves approve. But we should not suppose, that any material number of persons would refuse submission to measures, even if somewhat irregular, provided those measures were simply and *bonâ fide* for the purpose of removing decidedly Romish or Romanizing practices, ceremonies, &c.

But on the other hand, if any thing *more* were attempted—if under cover of this removal of Romanism it were attempted to

introduce peculiar views of the sacraments, or to limit the freedom of opinion which now exists on these points, or to lower the doctrine of the English Church as now settled, the result in the present state of men's minds might be fearful to contemplate. Let any step be taken, which, under the dictation of the temporal power, appeared to alter the doctrine of the Church of England, and left it out of the power of its advocates to say that doctrine remained unaltered; and a shock would be given to the Church of England, the effects of which might be most fearful. A schism would probably immediately take place, and the Established Church would lose thousands of clergy and hundreds of thousands of laity, and find a second rival episcopate established in the land.

The extreme difficulty and danger of any such attempt as we have referred to are sufficiently obvious: we do not, however, by any means intend to affirm that no attempt ought to be made to meet an evil which certainly exists—a strong tendency to Romanism in some quarters. There is danger evidently: the continued secessions prove that there is. If, then, it be requisite to take any steps for removing causes of distrust and division, let them be taken in the regular way. Let the Sovereign commend certain questions to the consideration of Convocation, with a view to provide a remedy for the evils complained of. Convocation would *undoubtedly* repress every thing that could be fairly considered as Romanism. It would require of every clergyman to renounce certain practices, and would give to ordinaries additional powers. Such a course would have this advantage, that the competency of Convocation has been fully recognised by all those who are usually liable to imputations of Romanizing. It would be impossible to oppose its decisions on the ground of standing up for the liberties of the Church.

If, however, there be insuperable objections to Convocation, then we would say, let any doctrinal questions be settled by the episcopate of the Church of England. We observe, that in the address of the laity to the Queen, adopted at the meeting in Freemasons' Hall, under the presidency of Lord Ashley, the authority of the heads of the Church is recognised. The passage to which we refer is as follows:—

“But we humbly entreat your Majesty, in the exercise of your Royal Prerogative, to direct the attention of the primates and bishops of the Church to the necessity of using all fit and lawful means to purify it from the infection of false doctrine, and as respects external and visible observances, in which many novelties have been introduced, to take care that measures may be promptly adopted for the repression of all such practices.”

We think that all real danger would be avoided in the present crisis, if the spirit of this suggestion were acted on, and the discussion of all points of importance in reference to the questions which have been raised in the matter of "Tractarianism" were referred to the Primates and Bishops of the Church. We believe that the result of such a reference would be satisfactory to the infinite majority of all real friends of the Church. We believe that it would meet the wishes of the Evangelical body generally, and that it would not be unsatisfactory to the great mass of the High-Church Clergy, because we feel assured that the bishops, as a body, would not act on the principle of driving out of the Church those who only hold the doctrines of all our greatest and most learned divines and bishops, such as Beveridge, Taylor, Hall, Leslie, Bingham, Bull, Van Mildert, Jebb, and Howley, but would repress tenets and practices which are of a Romish complexion and tendency. We must frankly say, that if this were accomplished, we should regard it as a benefit to the Church of England, and we are confident that a great body of High-Churchmen would support such a decision, and would have reason to feel thankful that any means were afforded them of testifying openly their adhesion to the principles of the Church of England, and their rejection of all that tends towards Romanism.

We are too sensible of the momentous nature of the consequences of any such course to venture on expressing any definite wish on the subject. But at the same time, if any thing should be done, we trust that the object of those who have influence will be to execute their work in as moderate a spirit as possible, consistently with their sense of duty. It has pleased God to throw the chief influence and guidance of the affairs of His Church in England into the hands of a party with whom we should not have sought for correctness of Church principle. The want of common sense, and the extravagancies of another party, and the secessions of its members to Rome, have delivered the Church into the hands which now sway it, supported by the national voice. Although we are unable to subscribe to all the views of that dominant party, we still trust, that love for the Church of England—regard for its security—and a disposition to tolerate differences of opinion in points which are not absolutely vital, will induce the heads of the Church at least, to adopt such a course as shall not drive honest, learned, and sincere members and ministers of the English Church in thousands out of her communion; but to limit themselves to the expulsion of what is plainly inconsistent with fidelity and attachment to the cause and the religion of the Reformation as established in England.

The enemies of the Church will urge the adoption of the most



sweeping measures—the establishment of levelling and latitudinarian principles, which would silence the mere claim of the Church of England to be a society founded by Christ and his Apostles. But we will indulge in the hope, that all persons of weight and influence, however they may be opposed to “Tractarianism,” will hesitate before they consent to break down any of the system which has been handed down to us from past ages, and that the power they may exercise will be used with something of that “common sense” which we must admit them to possess, and the absence of which will prove the ruin of “Tractarianism.” The leaders of the latter system have unfortunately always closed their eyes to the “signs of the times:” they have never known when to yield: they have ignored the people of England. We have now in consequence to see the inevitable triumph of a party which their imprudence alone has exalted. But, while we witness this result with regret, we still cherish the hope that God will watch over His Church amongst us, and not permit it to be further weakened by extensive secessions or expulsions, and that none may fall away except those who are either disloyal to the Church, or who will not permit their faults to be corrected by authority.

It is a matter of deep pain, that, as circumstances now stand, the Church is left a prey to the struggles of parties without any check or limit. In one direction, some men are permitted to declaim against the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration in such terms as amount to positive dissent from the Church of England. In another direction, men introduce Romanism, and, when they have played with it for a time, apostatize from their Church. We strongly disapprove of all party organizations and proceedings; but we regret to be obliged to admit, that the party which is more or less unsound on the point of Baptismal Regeneration is practically a less evil to the Church than another extreme party which is continually recruiting the Church of Rome with new converts. The apostasies which have taken place, and which are still in progress, are facts which are open to universal observation, and which absolutely close the mouths of those who wish to advocate Church principles. It is hopeless to argue that those principles do not lead to Romanism. We may ourselves see clearly that they ought not to do so, and may have arguments enough to prove that we are in the right; but we can never answer the *fact* of apostasies, so as to satisfy the public mind. It is in vain to pretend that the apostates were all Latitudinarians or Low-Churchmen; for they had subsequently adopted very different views.

The triumph which will be gained by the Evangelical party will, however, probably ere long be shared by another party,

which they will have reason to dread, at least as much as they do the "Tractarian" party. They will have to contend with Rationalism. Perhaps, when that contest arises, those Churchmen who have remained attached to their principles, though sobered and saddened by the reverses of their cause, will be enabled again to contend, without encountering suspicion and enmity, for the principles of the Christian faith. At present all sound Church principles—those principles which our great Divines in former ages have upheld, in their contests with the enemies of the Church of England—are exposed to undeserved obloquy and hatred; because they are identified with the exaggerations and Romish tendencies which have unfortunately been adopted by some of their advocates. When, however, it shall have been seen, that certain principles have carried those who hold them, through the difficulties of the times; and that they stand at the last where they began, opposed to Romish error and to Latitudinarian laxity; public opinion will, at length, gradually repair the injustice it has done.

---

ART. VII.—1. *Game Birds and Wild Fowl: their Friends and their Foes.* By A. E. KNOX, M.A., F.A.S. London: Van Voorst, 1850.

WE are not among the number of those who join in wholesale condemnation of the dog and gun. We cannot concur in the unmitigated abuse sometimes heaped upon field-sports by well-meaning people. True, indeed, destruction is the essence of sport, and the criterion of skill: true also, too true, that many an unoffending victim gasps out its little life in the secrets of the covert, while its mangled members add another witness to the wantonness of power in the self-styled "lord of the creation." All this is true, all this is humiliating, all this would damp our own enjoyment in the field: but we must not stop there. It would be unfair not to look at the other side. Restrained from excess, these sports afford opportunities for the exercise of many qualities, both of body and mind. They supply, in time of peace, a safety-valve for energies which cannot find a vent in graver deeds of arms; they offer, if not the most ennobling, at least an innocent amusement for idle hours. But, in making this admission, we have specially guarded ourselves on two points: first, they must be restrained from excess; secondly, they should be enjoyed strictly as a recreation. If carried to excess, they must degenerate into mere butchery; if pursued with too great avidity, amusement becomes occupation, and loses its innocence by handing over to trifles faculties and energies which were created for a nobler purpose. We are under no great apprehension in regard of the former point; while we cannot but regret that the foreign predilections of a high personage should have imported into this land the fashion of the *battue* (we could forgive him, if this were his *only* attempt to Germanise our mind and manners); we have too high an opinion of English generosity and love of fairness to fear that the old British mode of sport will ever give place to a system of carnage so abhorrent to one's better feelings. As to the undue devotion of our energies to a mere amusement, too much watchfulness cannot be observed. That which is fascinating from the healthy manliness which attaches to it, or the skill which it requires, is more than likely to prove too attractive for many.

It is easy to see how "nights shivered behind a stanchion



gun," and "a great portion of the early period of life devoted to the noble craft," may be not merely the recollections of a mere lover of the field, but also the confessions of that, which were innocent in moderation, made guilty by excess. And we must own that, to us, there is something approaching to the ludicrous in such a flourish as the following:—"the same energy and spirit which enabled him to overcome the numerous obstacles to a full enjoyment of this animating pastime in the British islands has at a later period, since serving with his regiment in the East, carried him"—whither? to the cannon's mouth, or the onslaught of the Affghan?—merely, "into the swamps and jungles of Indostan, in spite of Thugs, tigers, and fever, and rewarded him with the acquisition of many a sporting trophy."

Under due restriction, then, we repeat, we see no reason, upon the whole, to condemn field-sports, but rather the contrary. They at least afford scope for energy and skill, if they do not elevate the feelings or improve the mind. They are healthful and manly, though they fall far short of perfection.

But all this is irrespective of the means adopted to promote them. *Game-laws* and the *preservation* of game we hold in abhorrence: we have never heard a good argument in their favour; we believe that they cannot stand the test of inquiry by Christian men. If not *de facto* (for we know not the date of their first enactment), they are certainly in spirit the remnants of a former age; they are the very caterers for crime; *sibi ipsæ pabulum subministrant*—they create what they punish; they spring from the selfishness of the rich, and, setting a fictitious value on the objects of their protection, they work upon the disposition of human nature to taste what is forbidden, and, so working, conduce to a multiplicity of wrong. Erase the game-laws from the statute-book, divest pheasants, partridges, and hares, of their fictitious value, place them on a level with foxes and wild-fowl, by throwing open your coverts to any who can pull a trigger; and our belief is, that in ten years' time no hypocritical John Bright will have to move for committees of investigation in the House of Commons, nor any sincere philanthropists have to deplore such fatal conflicts as have lately stained the noble woods at Bolsover.

The causes which lead to poaching will, doubtless, be differently assigned by different minds: for our own part, we are inclined to take a view of the matter which will not find favour in the eyes of some. It is, no doubt, easy to get up an appeal *ad misericordiam*; and we agree with the author of the work before us as to "the encouragement which the profession of poaching has received of late years from the misapplied sympathy of morbid humanity-

mongers, and the verdict of many a magisterial bench." Looking at the statistics of crime, it is impossible to be deceived as to the condition of those who compose the great body of the poaching fraternity. *It is not want which drives them to this.* Here and there we may be told, and truly withal, a pitiful tale; but, in the majority of cases, the men who figure so plentifully at the Petty Sessions at this season of the year are men who might be, if they would, far removed from the impulses of that stern mistress which "has no laws:" labourers and mechanics too often stand charged with the well-known "trespass in pursuit of game." We have no documents at hand to prove this point; but it is the impression left upon our own minds by what we have ourselves read and learnt of such matters. Let the credulous consult any gaol-chaplain on the point. Englishmen—from the *sans-culottes* to those of gentler blood—do love the chase in whatever form it be offered. There is no denying this national characteristic. Hence the selfish preserve, and the unprincipled poach. *A fontibus derivantur amnes.* He who began with snigging a stray hare, more "to be even with the old squire" than for any graver cause, marches forth to his end with a miscreant gang, ready for the midnight fray with armed keepers. We deliberately repeat it: the landlord in a game-preserving district has a fearful question to ask himself. Legally, no doubt, he has a right to warn off the intruder from meddling with *any* part or species of his property. But why are hares, partridges, and pheasants to be differently treated in this respect from foxes, rats, or weasels? The former must equally with the latter be ranged under the head of vermin. What better fun than a day with lurchers in an old barn? yet who would dream of "preserving" rats? who could, if he would, keep a fox-hunt to himself? Once more, then, we feel that *the game-laws must be repealed.*

But to return from this digression, which is not exactly in our line; or, at least, we suspect, not much in our readers' line.

Were we inclined to despise all lovers of field-sports, an exception must, in fairness, be made in favour of those who can turn them to account for better purposes than the mere excitement of a shot. Upon the *mere* sportsman we do not look with much greater complacency than Dr. Johnson on an angler. The having bagged a certain number of head of game per diem is, after all, but a poor account to give of a portion of our annual life. It is little more than the exercise of manual dexterity in no very noble cause. But he enlists our warmest sympathies who can make the pleasures of the chase minister to the pursuit of science. Such an one is Mr. Knox. He modestly disclaims, indeed, for his very pleasing little book all pretension to a scientific treatise. Yet,

we must beg leave to say, that no man, who, as occasion serves, will "abandon both dog and gun for a couple of days, and relinquish for that time some of the best snipe-shooting in Ireland," and "pass many a cold and anxious hour in a well-concealed position," for the purpose of "improving his acquaintance with" the habits of a bird (in the case which we specially remember, it was a peregrine falcon in her winter quarters),—no man who will so wait upon nature with an effort and a sacrifice, not because he has no relish for sport, but because he relishes the higher pursuit more keenly still,—no man with such tastes and such perseverance can fail to add some grains to those little discoveries of nature, the aggregate of which we call knowledge.

Gentle reader ! if thou art half as weary as ourselves of controversy, half as satiated of polemics, thou wilt thank us for turning thy thoughts to matters of a lighter mould and a more peaceful hue. For the rest, then, of the space allotted to us, we will eschew all argument, abstain from criticism, and pull from these "*Game Birds and Wild Fowl*" such feathers as may tickle thy fancy, and add their quota to thine enjoyment of happy Christmastide.

We have already referred to Mr. Knox's observations of the falcon. Our first few extracts shall relate to this interesting bird :—

"It has often been a question with ornithologists in what precise manner the falcon deals the fatal blow. Some authors have asserted that it is by means of the foot ; others attribute it to the breast-bone, protected as it is by such strong pectoral muscles that the concussion which is supposed to deprive its victim of life can have no injurious effect upon the author of the momentum. My own opinion, which is fully corroborated by the more extensive experience of Colonel Bonham, is, that it is by means of the powerful hind talon that the deadly wound is inflicted. If a grouse, a duck, or a woodcock that has been thus suddenly killed by a peregrine be examined, it will generally be found that the loins and shoulders are deeply scored, the back of the neck much torn, and even the skull sometimes penetrated by this formidable weapon. Now, as the stroke is almost always delivered obliquely—that is, in a slanting, downward direction from behind—this laceration could not be effected by any of the talons of the front toes ; nor could the severest possible blow from the breast of the falcon produce such an effect. Indeed, Colonel Bonham had several rare opportunities of witnessing the operation distinctly ; and his testimony on this point ought to be conclusive. On one occasion in particular, when in Ireland, a woodcock, after a long chase over an adjoining moor, had taken refuge in a small cover, whither it was closely pursued by the hawk, the falconer and several assistants following. Colonel Bonham himself made for a nearer point of the coppice, and had just taken up his position under a tree at the side of a ride or alley, when he saw the



woodcock flying towards him, and its enemy close upon it. As the former passed within a few yards of the spot where he stood, he perceived, by its laborious flight and open beak, that it was much exhausted. The next moment down came the falcon, and he could see distinctly that the blow was inflicted by the *hind* talons. The effect was instantaneously fatal, and precisely such as might have been expected from the nature of the weapons that were brought into play. The back of the woodcock was completely ripped up, and the lower part of its skull split open."—pp. 169—171.

There are few points, perhaps, upon which one may hear greater variety of opinion and discrepancy of assertion, on the part of those who pretend to be knowing, than on the rate and distance of the flight of birds. Beyond question, these must vary with the several species. The question is,—Do they vary in the same species, at least, in any considerable degree. The following anecdote deserves to be preserved. Mr. Knox was hawking in the county of Monaghan, Ireland, when

"a woodcock 'took the air,' closely pursued by the falcon, who had her bells and 'varvels' on, with the name and address of the owner engraved upon them. In a short time, both birds had attained such an elevation, that it was only by lying down on their backs, and placing their hands above their eyes, so as to screen them from the rays of the sun, and at the same time contract the field of vision, that the spectators could keep them within view. At last, just as they had become almost like specks in the sky, they were observed to pass rapidly towards the north-east, under the influence of a strong south-west wind, and were soon completely out of sight. Some days elapsed without any tidings of the truant falcon; but, before the week had expired, a parcel arrived, accompanied by a letter, bearing a Scotch post-mark. The first contained the dead body of the falcon; the latter the closing chapter of her history, from the hand of her destroyer, a farmer who resided within ten miles of Aberdeen. He was walking through his grounds, when his attention was attracted by the appearance of a large hawk which had just dashed among his pigeons, and was then in the act of carrying one of them off. Running into the house, he returned presently with a loaded gun, and found the robber coolly devouring her prey on the top of a wheat-stack. The next moment the poor falcon's wanderings were at an end; but it was not until he had seen the bells on her feet that he discovered the value of his victim, and, upon a more careful examination, perceived the name and address of her owner; and while affording him the only reparation in his power, by sending him her remains and the account of her fate, he unconsciously rendered the story worthy of record in a sporting and an ornithological point of view; for, on a subsequent comparison of dates, it was found that she had been shot near Aberdeen, on the eastern coast of Scotland, within forty-eight hours after she had been flown at

the woodcock in a central part of the province of Ulster, in Ireland."—pp. 171—173.

That is, somewhere about 280 miles within eight-and-forty hours, and therefore only six miles per hour, supposing its flight to have been continuous ; but then, rapidity of flight is not an accomplishment of which hawks in the nineteenth century can boast. There is on record a notable instance of their swiftness of which there is no reason, we believe, to doubt the accuracy. It is related of a falcon, belonging to Henry IV., king of France, that it traversed the distance between Malta and Fontainebleau, not less than 1350 miles, in twenty-four hours. In this case, supposing it to have been on the wing the whole time, its rate of flight must have been nearly sixty miles an hour ; but, as falcons do not fly by night, it was probably not more than sixteen or eighteen hours on the wing, and its rate must, therefore, have been seventy or eighty miles an hour.

While upon the subject of the falcon we cannot resist transcribing the following anecdote, recounted by the author with a view to rescuing the character of his favourite bird from the imputation of insusceptibility of personal attachment. It is as follows :—

"The late Colonel Johnson, of the Rifle Brigade, was ordered to Canada with his battalion ; and, being very fond of falconry, he took with him two of his favourite peregrines, as his companions across the Atlantic.

"It was his constant habit during the voyage to allow them to fly every day, after 'feeding them up,' that they might not be induced to rake off after a passing seagull, or wander out of sight of the vessel. Sometimes their rambles were very wide and protracted. At others, they would ascend to such a height as to be almost lost to the view of the passengers, who soon found them an effectual means of relieving the tedium of a long sea-voyage, and naturally took a lively interest in their welfare ; but, as they were in the habit of returning regularly to the ship, no uneasiness was felt during their occasional absence. At last, one evening, after a longer flight than usual, one of the falcons returned alone. The other—the prime favourite—was missing. Day after day passed away ; and, however Captain Johnson may have continued to regret his loss, he had, at length, fully made up his mind that it was irretrievable, and that he should never see her again. Soon after the arrival of the regiment in America, on casting his eyes over a Halifax newspaper, he was struck by a paragraph announcing that the captain of an American schooner had at that moment in his possession a fine hawk, which had suddenly made its appearance on board his ship during his late passage from Liverpool. The idea at once occurred to Captain Johnson, that this could be no other than his much-prized falcon ; so, having obtained immediate leave of absence,

he set out for Halifax—a journey of some days. On arriving there, he lost no time in waiting on the commander of the schooner, announcing the object of his journey, and requesting that he might be allowed to see the bird. But Jonathan had no idea of relinquishing his prize so easily, and stoutly refused to admit of the interview, ‘guessing’ that it was very easy for an Englisher to lay claim to another man’s property, but ‘calculating’ it was a ‘tarnation sight’ harder for him to get possession of it; and concluded by asserting in unqualified terms his entire disbelief in the whole story. Captain Johnson’s object, however, being rather to recover his falcon than to pick a quarrel with the truculent Yankee, he had fortunately sufficient self-command to curb his indignation; and proposed that his claim to the ownership of the bird should be at once put to the test by an experiment, which several Americans, who were present, admitted to be perfectly reasonable, and in which their countryman was at last persuaded to acquiesce. It was this:—Captain Johnson was to be admitted to an interview with the hawk, who, by the way, had as yet shown no partiality for any person since her arrival in the New World, but, on the contrary, had rather repelled all attempts at familiarity, and if at this meeting she should not only exhibit such unequivocal signs of attachment and recognition as should induce the majority of the bystanders to believe that he really was her original master, but especially if she should play with the buttons of his coat, then the American was at once to waive all claim to her. The trial was immediately made. The Yankee went up stairs, and shortly returned with the falcon; but the door was hardly opened before she darted from his fist, and perched at once on the shoulder of her beloved and long-lost protector, evincing by every means in her power her delight and affection, rubbing her head against his cheek, and taking hold of the buttons of his coat, and champing them playfully between her mandibles, one after another. This was enough. The jury were unanimous. A verdict for the plaintiff was pronounced. Even the obdurate heart of the sea-captain was melted, and the falcon was at once restored to the arms of her rightful owner.”—pp. 177—180.

But the Order *Raptores* is not the only one which has fallen under Mr. Knox’s observation. The Rasorial and Natatorial families—as it were to be expected—come in for their share of the sportsman’s attention. Two chapters are devoted to the Pheasant; and he favours the world with a series of remarks, the result of his own “considerable” experience on the “best mode of hatching, rearing, and breeding” them. Of these, different opinions will probably be formed, differing as his recommendations do, in some points, from established usage. For our own part, we have read them with so much interest, and have heard them so well spoken of by some qualified to form a judgment on the matter, that we purpose to lay some of his remarks before our readers; premising that he is not alluding



to the system of bringing up young pheasants in aviaries, fowl-yards, and enclosures, but to rearing out of doors, and turning down in preserves, a number of healthy poults. He begins, by laying down as a safe principle, that, where possible, every thing should be left to nature. On this principle, he is of opinion that

“the eggs of pheasants, even when found in an outlying nest, should not be taken for the purpose of placing them under barn-door hens to be hatched. No foster-mother or nurse can compare with the natural parent; and it is surprising—indeed, almost incredible, except to those who have witnessed it—how frequently a hen-pheasant will succeed in bringing up her brood in safety, although the nest may be placed in the most exposed and dangerous situation, within a few inches of a foot-path traversed by hundreds of idle, bird-nesting boys, and in the immediate vicinity of a common or waste ground, where the authority of the landlord is a dead letter, and where, except for the safeguard which the quiet and unobtrusive colours of her plumage afford, the speedy detection of the bird would inevitably take place.”

Still there are circumstances under which it may be desirable to remove the eggs. Should such arise, they ought, when removed, to be covered with several handfuls of soft, dry grass, placed in a handkerchief, and lodged as soon as possible in a cool cellar, unless there is a sufficient number for a sitting, and a domestic hen ready for immediate incubation. The author does not join in the recommendation of bantams for this purpose, owing to their diminutive size; neither in that of the large Dorking fowl, having “seen so many cases of unintentional infanticide committed by these huge, clumsy-legged, five-toed matrons.” Nor, for the sake of the little members of a neighbouring clutch, does he approve of the truculent game-hen for a foster-mother. What he has generally found to answer best for the purpose is a cross between a common dunghill hen and the game fowl.

“As soon as the young birds are hatched they should be left with their mother for a day and a night; during which time they require no food, nature having provided nutriment for their immediate sustenance in the yolk of the egg, the residue of which has been recently drawn into the body of the chicken and absorbed; but the genial warmth of her body, under which they all nestle, is of the greatest importance to them. The first food that should be given them is ants’ eggs. These are, strictly speaking, the cocoons of the large rufous ant (*formica rufa*), which are tolerably plentiful in most great woods during the summer. The nests are of considerable elevation, cone-shaped, and constructed generally of very small twigs and leaves of the Scotch fir. Some persons find it difficult to separate the eggs from the materials of the nest. The simplest mode is to place as much as may be required

—ants, eggs, and all—in a bag or light sack, the mouth of which should be tied up. On reaching home, a large white sheet should be spread on the grass, and a few green boughs placed round it on the inside, over which the outer edge of the sheet should be lightly turned; this should be done during sunshine. The contents of the bag should then be emptied into the middle, and shaken out so as to expose the eggs to the light. In a moment, forgetting all considerations of personal safety, these interesting little insects set about removing their precious charge—the cocoons—from the injurious rays of the sun, and rapidly convey them under the shady cover afforded by the foliage of the boughs near the margin of the sheet. In less than ten minutes the work will be completed. It is only necessary then to remove the branches; and the eggs, or cocoons, may be collected by handfuls, unincumbered with sticks, leaves, or any sort of rubbish.

“Many kinds of farinaceous and vegetable food have been recommended for young pheasants when they are a little older; such as green tops of barley, leaks, boiled rice, Embden groats, oatmeal, &c. They are all excellent; but I am satisfied that they are almost always given at too early a period. In a state of nature, their food for a long time would be almost wholly insectile. Now, as it is not in our power to procure the quantity and variety of small insects and larva which the mother so perseveringly and patiently finds for them, we are obliged to have recourse to ants’ eggs, as easily accessible and furnishing a considerable supply of the necessary sort of aliment within a small compass. Ants’ eggs, indeed, are the right hand of the keeper when bringing up young pheasants: without them he may almost despair of success; and with a good stock of them his birds will thrive apace, and escape many diseases to which they would otherwise be continually liable.”

We have extracted the foregoing passage *in extenso*, because we consider that it involves a principle, having a much wider range of application than that of pheasant-rearing—that of a close imitation of nature. The author next instructs us as to the construction of the coops, which he recommends to be moved morning and evening, as the hen ought to have a fresh piece of green-sward underneath her twice every day. “Attention to this point” he declares to be “of the greatest importance.” But we will conclude the subject with another extract relative to the food of the young ones:—

“When about a week or ten days old, Embden groats and coarse Scotch oatmeal may be mixed with the ants’ eggs, and curds made from fresh milk with alum, are an excellent addition. If ants’ eggs cannot be procured in sufficient quantities, gentles should be occasionally given, which may be procured in the following manner: An ox-liver, a sheep’s head and pluck, or the leg of a horse, should be suspended from the bough of a tree in a warm, sheltered situation. Beneath this, a wide shallow tub, half filled with bran, should be placed. In a short

time, the meat will be thoroughly fly-blown, and in a few more days, it will be covered with maggots, or gentles, which will continue to drop into the tub, where they soon become cleaned and purged in the bran. A large spoon or saucer may be used for removing them. Next to ants' eggs, these, perhaps, constitute the best 'standing-dish' for young pheasants, and have, besides, the advantage of being within the reach of every breeder. Wasps' nests, containing the larvæ and pupæ, may be procured without difficulty at a later period of the season, and afford a most acceptable treat. If the supply of these should be too great for immediate use, or if it should be thought advisable to economize the stock, it will be necessary to bake them for a short time in an oven. This will prevent the larvæ and nymphs from coming to maturity—in fact, kill them—and the contents of the combs will keep for some weeks afterwards. Hempseed, crushed and mingled with oatmeal, should be given when about to wean them from an insect diet. Hard-boiled eggs also form a useful addition, and may be mixed for a long time with their ordinary farinaceous food. A supply of fresh water is important."

The following, which we select from another part of the volume, is amusing, as showing the maternal ingenuity of birds to evade discovery by one species of enemy, as contrasted with that of another enemy to outwit them:—

"The eggs [of the pheasant] are usually deposited in rank grass on the sides of hedges and ditches, in narrow plantations, or in meadows, clover, or corn-fields; and very rarely in the heart of great woods or covers, to which localities the keeper is generally too apt to confine his attention. When suddenly disturbed, the hen will sometimes rise at once, as she would if leaving her nest voluntarily in search of food, and thus expose her treasure to the eyes of any wandering clown who may have unintentionally stumbled on the spot; but more frequently she has recourse to artifice, and on the approach of danger, quietly slips off her eggs, and runs with a noiseless pace for a considerable distance before she takes wing. On returning to the nest, however, she adopts a different manœuvre, and if her only enemies were of that class usually denominated vermin, it would almost invariably be attended with success. She continues on the wing until she arrives immediately over the nest, and then drops at once upon it, thus leaving no beaten track through the long grass, by which the indefatigable stoat or the prowling cat could find a ready clue to her citadel, or which would at once catch the eye of the cunning magpie or the hungry crow while sailing over the field on a preying expedition. With the poacher, however, the case is different. He has only to secrete himself under a tree, or, it may be, to sit leisurely on a neighbouring stile, immediately after feeding time in the early morning or in the afternoon, and watch the female bird as she returns to the fields in the vicinity of the preserves. He fixes his eye on her as she comes skimming over the hedge, and marks the exact



spot where she drops among the weeds, grass, or clover. If this should happen not to be in the middle of the field, or if anxious to secure his prize immediately, he walks round with apparent unconcern—keeping close to the hedge all the time, and never once taking his eyes from the spot—until he arrives at the spot nearest to the nest, and then stepping up quickly, bags the eggs as expeditiously as possible : but should he think that his tactics have been observed or his intentions suspected, he coolly ‘takes an observation’ by means of trees, or any other prominent objects, and accurately marking their relative bearing to the situation of the nest, he is then at leisure either to watch for a fresh arrival in the same quarter, or to pursue his avocation in a different direction until the shades of evening enable him to complete his work in security.”

Mr. Knox is severe, but not more so than is deserving, in his remarks upon “egg stealers,” who—“without a spark of the mere brute courage which animates the night-shooter, or the skill and talent for evading discovery which characterize the successful wirer or trapper,—possess not a single redeeming quality, and can have no claim whatever on the sympathies of even the most tender-hearted philanthropists.”

A singular instance is recorded of intense cold, which may be introduced here as not uncongenial with the shivery day on which we are writing. The occurrence took place in the winter of 1838--9, at which time Mr. Knox was living at Bognor. About the middle of January he set out on an excursion to Pagham Harbour, in quest of the wild fowl which congregate so thickly upon its muddy flats and calm waters. “On my way,” he writes,—

“I met with a singular evidence of the extreme intensity of the cold. Several fish of different kinds lay scattered at intervals on the beach, some dead, others dying, but all in a perfectly fresh state, having been frozen in their lairs at the bottom of the sea, and cast up by the waves. Some of these were of a species entirely new to me, and which I have never since met with. Their colours were indescribably beautiful. Every hue of the rainbow seemed to have been transferred to their scales. My astonishment could hardly have been surpassed by that of the poor fisherman in the ‘Arabian Nights,’ when he drew forth the variegated fish from the enchanted lake. I could not help regarding this discovery as a lucky omen for myself; so, having selected half-a-dozen of the brightest, I concealed them under a heap of pebbles, and continued on my way to the harbour.”

Mr. Knox adds in a note, that Mr. Yarrell, to whom he related the circumstance, “conjectures that these fish belonged to the Wrasse family (*labridæ*), some of the rarer species of which are remarkable for their beautiful iridescent colours.” We have given this story as we find it; but Mr. Knox will pardon us, if we confess ourselves a little sceptical as to the *place* in which he so

unhesitatingly affirms these fish to have been frozen. Do not well ascertained facts, relative to the temperature of the sea at various depths, render it highly improbable that they should have been frozen "in their rocky lairs at the bottom of the sea?" The truth is, that the sea *never* freezes at the *bottom*, and therefore could not congeal the fish there: but it often freezes at the surface, and the growing ice having hemmed in some of its inhabitants, froze them. We apprehend that this is a more probable explanation of the phenomenon to which the author was witness.

We cannot resist the following description of an *Irish* woodcock battue. It is genuine:—

"The southern and western provinces are more celebrated than the northern and eastern, although I have had good sport in them all. When the party is numerous a great number of cocks are killed in the large woods; twenty-five, thirty, and even forty couple being frequently the result of one day's sport. It is usual on such occasions to employ a host of beaters, whose proceedings are conducted upon a very different plan from that generally observed by the steady-going assistants of the pheasant shooter in England. A heterogeneous army of men and boys—whose appearance might recall the description of Falstaff's ragged recruits at Coventry,—each furnished with a long pole, are drawn up at one side of the cover. The guns are either placed at intervals where a backward growth of the brushwood may afford them the chance of getting a shot as they work through its mazes—for rides or alleys are but little known in these wild, natural woods—or else station themselves in different parts of the coppice, or on some eminence that commands a wider range of view—and these are the most knowing ones of the party—until at last the word is given to advance, when each beater shouting 'Heigh cock!' at the very top of his voice, and laying his stick about him with all the energy of a thrasher, such an uninterrupted and discordant row ensues as might well startle every cock within hearing from his place of concealment, and, in fact, causes numbers of those birds to spring prematurely from distant parts of the wood. Here, however, those wary gunners who have previously taken up their position on favourable heights possess a great advantage, and bring down many woodcocks as they fly in various directions, sometimes towards the beaters, sometimes in the face of the shooter, each struggling to escape the danger, but not knowing from which quarter it proceeds. By this time all discipline is at an end. Some of 'the boys' having caught a glimpse of a falling woodcock in the distance, now fling away their poles, and rush to the spot, all anxious to be the first to pick up the bird, and to congratulate the successful shooter on his dexterity; who, by the way, receives their compliments with marked ingratitude, as they come rushing through the cover, insist on keeping close to his person, and so, effectually spoil his sport for the rest of the day. The same scene is probably enacting in ten different places at once. All order is at an end. Far

away in the distance the cry of 'Heigh cock! Heigh cock!' during the intervals of the confusion from a solitary beater who as yet has listened to nothing but the sound of his own voice, and instead of proceeding in a straight line, has made a wide circuit, and now finds himself unexpectedly at the very point from which he started; while another, who has independently advanced all alone, and at least half an hour too soon to the opposite end of the wood, is flashing the cocks by dozens, without for a moment considering where the guns are, or which way the affrighted birds take, but delighted all the time at his own performance, while the distant sportsman inwardly curses him from his heart. Many a cunning old beater, too, who has been too long used to the thing to feel any excitement in it, drops quietly into the rear, and squatting quietly under a half-bush, lights his 'dudeen' with the utmost *sang froid*, regardless of all that is passing around him. At last, the storm gradually subsides. A few dropping shots alone proceed from the intervals from the outskirts of the wood. The shooters and beaters emerge, one by one, at different sides, all eloquent on the subject of their own performances, not excepting him of the dudeen, who exultingly points to sundry recent scratches on his face and shins, and swears that he 'never had such hard work in the whole course of his life.'"

But it is time that we take leave of Mr. Knox—we hope, only for the present: one, gifted with his keenness of pursuit and intelligence of observation, cannot fail, when he turns author, to be both amusing and instructive in his peculiar line. And we can assure our rural readers that, in the work before us, they will find several useful hints and interesting remarks, from the best mode of breeding a retriever to a generous deprecation of the persecution of the harmless squirrel and the useful mole.



## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

1. *Journal of a Tour in Italy.* By Rev. Geo. Townsend. 2. *Sermons for the Holy Days observed in the Church of England.* By Rev. J. H. Pinder. 3. *Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth most conducive to Human Happiness.* By W. Thompson. 4. *Light in the Dark Places.* Translated from the German of the late Augustus Neander. 5. *The Four Gospels Combined.* 6. *War ; religiously, morally, and historically considered.* By P. T. Aiken, Advocate. 7. *The Book of Common Prayer.* By Rev. R. Mant. 8. *A Catechism of the Holy Scriptures for the Use of Church Schools.* By Rev. E. J. Phipps. 9. *The Wedding Gift.* By Rev. W. E. Heygate. 10. *Daily Steps towards Heaven.* 11. *Brief Outline of the Study of Theology.* By the late Dr. Friedrich Schleiermacher. 12. *Reflections of the Past.* By the Author of "Daniel the Prophet." 13. *The Theory of Baptism.* By the Rev. G. Croly, LL.D. 14. *A History of the Holy Eastern Church. Part I.* By the Rev. J. M. Neale. 15. *Ordination, Matrimony, Vectigalia, and Extreme Unction, Theologically Considered.* By the Rev. D. P. M. Hulbert. 16. *Remarks on Architecture of Llandaff Cathedral.* 17. *Mrs. Jameson's Legends of the Monastic Orders.* 18. *The Church and the People.* By Rev. Christopher Robinson. 19. *Cornish's Selection of Psalms and Hymns.* 20. *The Philosophy of Spirits, &c.* By C. M. Burnett, M. D. 21. *Letters to Young People.* 22. *Robinson's Leisure Hours in a Country Parsonage.* 23. *A Score of Lyrics.* 24. *Readings for the Aged.* By Rev. J. M. Neale. 25. *"Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Book of Revelation?"* By Dr. Wordsworth. 26. *Remains of the late Rev. H. F. Lyte.* 27. *The Churchman's Diary.* 28. *The Revelation of Jesus Christ explained agreeably to the Analogy of the Holy Scripture.* 29. *A Letter to Lord Ashley.* By W. J. Edge. 30. *Eidolon.* By W. R. Cassels. 31. *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles.* By Rev. E. H. Browne. 32. *A Selection from the Sermons and Practical Remains of the Rev. G. J. Cornish.* 33. *The Life of James Davies.* Written by Sir Thos. Phillips. 34. *Archdeacon Bather's Sermons on Old Testament Histories.* 35. *Moody's Exposition of the New Testament.* 36. *The Danger and the Foe.* By Rev. A. Gurney. 37. *The Old Paths of the Church of England.* By Rev. D. Butler. 38. *Tales and Allegories.* 39. *Old Christians.* 40. *The Christian Year.* 41. *Rev. Jas. Beaven's Catechism on the Thirty-nine Articles.* 42. *Eastbury.* By A. H. Drury.—Miscellaneous.

- 
- 1.—*Journal of a Tour in Italy, in 1850, with an Account of an Interview with the Pope, at the Vatican.* By the Rev. GEORGE TOWNSEND, D.D., Canon of Durham, &c. London : Rivingtons.

To those who have given much attention to the principles of the Church of Rome, it will at first sight appear almost inexplicable, how a person of the experience, and the attainments of Dr. Townsend, could have persuaded himself of the possibility that the Pope might be induced to consent to the summoning of a general council for the decision of the controversies existing amongst professing Christians, on the principle that dogmas already defined and recognized as articles of faith in the Romish Church, should be open to further discussion. Dr. Townsend appears to admit that his view of such a proceeding as possible,

is peculiar to himself; but he has formed his opinion, as it seems, not so much from a contemplation of the apparent facilities or difficulties of the case, as from his view of what is predicted in Prophecy, his opinion being that the Church of Rome will ultimately relinquish its errors and embrace the truth.

There is much amusing matter in this Journal, and some very instructive matter. In the latter respect, we refer more especially to the strong evidence which is supplied in various places to the prevalent opinion of Romanists abroad, that England is gradually returning to its obedience to the See of Rome. This is especially stated in the following account of the conclusion of the author's interview with Cardinal Mai, at Rome:—

“Some English books were shown to me; and in making some remarks upon them, I observed that it could not be expected that the nation which had produced such works, would ever be again submissive to Rome. I shall never forget the expressive manner in which the Cardinal paused, and pronounced the word *Paulatim*, ‘By degrees.’ He was evidently, as I found from this, and from some other expressions uttered in the course of our remarks on the books before us, impressed with the conviction,—which seemed, indeed, to be general among his brethren,—that England was returning to the adoption of the Papal additions to the faith of Christ. I sighed at the mistake, and expressed again my conviction and my hope that this could never be: and he again said with emphasis, *Paulatim*.”—pp. 112, 113.

Poor Dr. Townsend appears to have found all parties agreed in assuring him that his designs were altogether visionary and unpractical. From the Pope down to the layman of the Romish communion, and from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Free-Church Presbyterian, every one he conversed with regarded his plans as involving impossibilities; and the Doctor appears himself at length to have arrived reluctantly at the same conclusion. The account of the interview with the Pope has rather disappointed us. It was, to be sure, conducted under rather unfavourable circumstances, as neither Dr. Townsend nor the Pope appear to have understood each other except very imperfectly, in consequence of the difference between the Italian and the English mode of pronouncing Latin.

- 11.—*Sermons for the Holydays observed in the Church of England, throughout the Year. By the Rev. JOHN H. PINDER, M.A., Principal of the Wells Theological College, and Precentor of Wells Cathedral.* London: Rivingtons.

FROM all that we have perused of this volume, we are enabled to speak of it in terms of the highest commendation, as thoroughly sound in its general tone of doctrine, and as combining instruc-

tion, interest, and a sincere and fervent piety in a very unusual degree. The excellent writer is indeed one who appears "rightly to divide the word of truth," and who is able to provide "milk" and "strong meat" according to the capacities of his hearers. The volume before us will be found to supply abundant materials for profitable study in private, and to the clergy its utility will be very great. We should rejoice to see a course of Sunday sermons for the year from the same pen. We have never seen more admirable parochial sermons.

III. — *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth most conducive to Human Happiness.* By WILLIAM THOMPSON. A new Edition by WILLIAM PACE. London: Orr and Co.

THE first edition of this work was published about thirty years ago, but fell "still-born" from the press. It is now re-published in a cheaper and abridged form by Mr. Pace, who appears to be a Socialist, and ascribes the formation of his own opinions to the work which he has now edited. The principles here put forward are very much those of Owen, the founder of New Lanark. They amount to the equalization of all classes, the abolition of primogeniture, entails, religious establishments, universities, and every thing else which interferes with the equality of man. We observe one curious omission. The author holds that it is absurd and wrong to restrain or coerce in any way the gratification of the sensual appetites; and he supposes the people to have ample means of gratifying them by eating and drinking as much as they please. The difficulty, of course, would occur, that, if you give men drink *ad libitum*, the result will be habits of drunkenness, which would destroy all order and decency. Our author *does not deal with this question at all*; but limits himself to the easier question, how excess in *eating* is to be prevented. This one example is a sufficient indication that the writer does not look at the practical difficulties of the case.

IV. — *Light in the Dark Places; or, Memorials of Christian Life in the Middle Ages.* Translated from the German of the late AUGUSTUS NEANDER. London: Low.

THIS little volume comprises a series of short biographies of eminent missionaries and Christians during the dark ages, much on the same plan as that adopted in Mr. Palmer's compendious Ecclesiastical History, from which we are inclined to think the notion of the book was derived. The sketches of Christian life in this publication are very pleasing and instructive; and we have not observed any thing in its tone which could offend Churchmen, or, indeed, any one else,



v.—*The Four Gospels combined; or, the Life of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as narrated by the Four Evangelists, &c.*  
London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

A VERY good idea is well carried out in this publication. It presents a continuous Narrative of the Life of Christ, without deviating from the words of Scripture. The compiler observes, that although the chain of the separate narratives has been broken and linked together again in upwards of 1800 places, the only additions that have been made have been these: The words *or, in, it, her, him, and them* have been introduced once only; *the* has been inserted twice—*they*, four times—*he*, six times—*and*, twenty-three times. One or two more trifling additions are made and specified. Nothing is omitted, except what is elsewhere as fully or more fully stated. The author adds, that the omission of repetitions reduces the combined length of the Gospels by only one eighth. These are curious facts, and the author has, on the whole, brought together a valuable English Harmony of the Gospels.

vi.—*War; Religiously, Morally, and Historically considered.*  
By P. T. AIKEN, *Advocate*. London: Hamilton and Adams.

THE author of this Essay is a man of sense, and while opposed to all unjust aggressive war, yet holds that it is necessary to protect ourselves. It appears that there are some advocates of peace who go to this length, and Mr. Aiken thus discusses the subject with them:—

“If some subjects resist their rulers wrongfully in open rebellion; if foreigners, on some unlawful pretext, threaten to invade our shores, shall no avenging arm be uplifted to prevent and to punish them, although both might and right are on our side? Shall robbers and murderers be made to suffer for their crimes against individuals, but when they conspire in multitudes and rebel against the whole nation, shall they be allowed to prosecute their nefarious designs unresisted, and to accomplish them with impunity? Shall an armed host of spoilers and manslayers from abroad, prepared for rapine, bloodshed, conflagration, and remorseless ruin, be tamely permitted to land on our coasts, slaughter the dismayed inhabitants, and devastate the country?

“Some amiable and very estimable men take this view of the unlawfulness even of defensive war. Rebels, it is said, or foreign invaders, may sack and burn our towns and villages; our mothers, wives, and daughters may be carried off by a licentious and brutal soldiery; our country may be ruined, its power broken, its glorious institutions perish, the abodes of domestic peace, comfort, and happiness be laid

waste with fire and slaughter, and the remnant of the miserable inhabitants be enslaved,—but we must not fight. Our repugnance to battle is not from cowardice, but from principle; our courage may be strong, but our consciences must be tender. Brave as lions, we must be gentle as doves.

“These pacific sentiments, when conscientious, are to be respected. If all mankind were to think and act thus, wars would cease. But as this is still a wicked and a warring world, we are compelled to believe, that the time has not yet come when it is possible to dispense with policemen and soldiers, or that we can safely turn our gaols into granaries and our swords into ploughshares.

“After the unusual interval of peace among the nations of Europe for more than thirty years, civil war broke forth in France, and spread from nation to nation; Milan, Genoa, Messina, Naples, Venice, Berlin, Vienna, were successively a prey to revolutionary war. It overspread the plains of Lombardy, it travelled along the Rhine, it reached Denmark, it broke forth at Rome; it raged so fiercely in Hungary, that Austria, divided against herself, was glad to owe her preservation to Russian armies. There have been tumults and bloody conflicts in the streets of many of the chief cities of Europe; battles in the tented field, sieges, bombardments, burnings and massacres, desolation, and misery. The degree of peace and security which Europe enjoys, has been obtained in the various countries where those revolutions occurred, by the suppression of an organized conspiracy, extending from kingdom to kingdom, to overthrow the established governments, to dissolve existing institutions, and on the ruins of the old social system to erect a new one, in which public and private property were to be seized and distributed, and all things were to be enjoyed in common, until all things were consumed. From this happy consummation the continental nations have been preserved *by means of their armies.*”

The author proceeds to vindicate the character of soldiers from the imputations cast on them by the advocates of non-resistance.

“And are we to view in the odious light of transgressors our soldiers and sailors, who disregard blood and wounds, who bear the brunt of battle, risking their own lives in defence of our lives and liberties and happiness? Were those victories, for which our best naval and military officers have received honours and rewards, only public wrongs? Is Christian England—is Christendom in error for supposing that armies and navies are not necessarily bands of robbers and murderers?

“The army of Gustavus Adolphus, the Protestant King of Sweden, used to assemble for worship. Munro, an officer who served in that army, describes them before the battle of Leipzig, by public and private prayers ‘recommending ourselves, the success and event of the day, to God.’ The soldiers flocked around their Swedish minister, and besought him to preach. Overpowered by his feelings, as he surveyed the field and the two armies, he said, ‘My brethren, yonder is the enemy!’ He pointed to the sky, ‘There is God—Pray!’ The min-

ister and the soldiers fell on their knees in silent adoration. Many of Cromwell's Ironsides, notwithstanding their fanaticism, were really devout and moral men; and it was their moral and enthusiastic courage, under a skilful commander, which changed the fortune of the civil war, and the aspect of affairs in England. To maintain a good character in the condition of a soldier, is to maintain it under trying circumstances; as it is also peculiarly difficult to be virtuous amid the temptations which riches or extreme poverty supply. But there are officers who have made their companies, their regiments, and their ships, by proper attention to the religious and moral conduct of the men, patterns to the rest of the army and navy of what good soldiers and sailors ought to be, and might far more generally become. We are to remember that the Jews, a peculiar people, and to whom, at one time, alone was committed the true worship, were enjoined to keep strictly the moral law, and yet were a nation of warriors, and that sanctioned by the Divine government."

The authority of Scripture is then referred to, in proof of the lawfulness of bearing arms at the command of the civil magistrate, and generally for self-defence, according to the principle laid down in the Thirty-ninth Article of the Church of England.

The author in his second chapter gives a sketch of the vast European war in the time of Napoleon Buonaparte; and having pointed out the fact, that a peace of thirty-five years' duration has been purchased by military prowess, proceeds to meet an objection to the cost of standing armies.

"But armies and navies cost a great deal of money. It also costs money to insure warehouses against fire, vessels and their cargoes against shipwreck. Yet prudent men prefer to pay for insurance, rather than risk ruin; and a wise people will choose to be taxed for their defence, rather than dwell in perpetual insecurity. A rich and unwarlike kingdom is an irresistible temptation to poorer and more martial states; and if Great Britain, with her vast territorial and commercial wealth, and manufacturing industry, her colonies and settlements in every quarter of the globe, were to neglect the armaments necessary for her protection, a catastrophe might ensue, not only fatal to this country, but which would resound through the world, and be detrimental to the best and highest interests of the human race.

"It is true that in the year 1701, the national debt of Great Britain was only about 15,000,000*l.*, that in seventy-four years it had increased to 125,000,000*l.*, and after the lapse of another seventy-five years, in 1850, amounts to about 800,000,000*l.* Our ancestors fought for themselves and their posterity, not always wisely and justly, but, on the whole, we have not much cause to complain, considering the momentous interests involved in their wars, and the victories they obtained. Great reason have we for gratitude to Providence, that we, their successors, occupy so elevated and responsible a position, possess such vast influ-



ence for good or evil, and enjoy so many and so great blessings. We may regret that those wars were carried on with such lavish expenditure, especially in subsidies to foreign states, by which so heavy a debt was contracted, and the burden of its repayment devolved on us and our descendants. But the victory at Waterloo, having been the means of procuring thirty-five years of peace, posterity may blame us who have lived during that time, and the governments, who have courted popularity by taking off taxes, whenever there was a surplus revenue; thus transmitting to the indefinite, and perhaps troubled future, the national debt almost undiminished. By a wise economy we might adequately provide for our country's defence, and also set apart a surplus revenue in the sinking fund. But the lovers of peace may console themselves with the reflection, that if they have to pay for past wars and present security, the heavy incumbrances of European nations are among the impediments to the renewal and continuance of hostilities."—pp. 59—61.

It appears from the statements of this writer, that the suffering and loss of life in wars now, are far less than in ancient times, when the use of artillery was unknown. Various instances of gallantry in battle are recorded in the following passages:—

"British soldiers and sailors never desert the national flag which floats over their ship, and is borne into the thickest fight. In Lord Howe's engagement with the French fleet, on the first of June, 1794, the 'Marlborough' in breaking the enemy's line, was dismasted, and had all her colours shot away. Appleford, an English sailor, called to his messmates, 'The English colours shall never be doused where I am!' He hoisted a marine's red jacket on a boarding pike, and the sailors fought under that standard till the victory was won. Appleford, during the same action, rivalled the heroism of Coriolanus. The dismasted 'Marlborough' had drifted under the bows of a French eighty-four, and Appleford climbed the bowsprit and alone drove the Frenchmen from the forecastle. Not being followed by any of the crew of the Marlborough, which began to drift away, he made good his retreat along the bowsprit of the French man-of-war, just in time to leap down into his own ship.

"At Waterloo, the standard-bearer of a Scottish regiment, when mortally wounded, held the colours so firmly in his dying grasp, that a serjeant of the regiment could only rescue them by carrying off on his shoulders the dead soldier and the colours together, in the presence of the enemy.

"During the civil wars in the reign of Charles I., there were many examples of female heroism, as in the gallant defence of castles and fortified houses by ladies, in the absence of their husbands. The wives of British sailors have sometimes helped them to serve the guns. During the assault of Zaragoza, when the French had killed or disabled every Spanish soldier on the battery of Portillo, Augustina Zaragoza rushed to the battery, fired a cannon, and, by her heroic conduct, ani-

mated her fellow citizens to renew the combat. She was pensioned by the government, and has a place in history. And there, also, the young and beautiful Countess of Burita was perhaps more appropriately employed with a company of women, who fearlessly carried refreshments and afforded help to the wounded soldiers, while shot and shells flew around them."—pp. 94—96.

On the whole we should think this little work an admirable antidote to the follies of the "Peace Societies," who denounce all war, however just, and would insist on our being disarmed, and left a prey to the French or any other nation that chose to attack us.

VII.—*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, &c., with Notes. By the Right Rev. RICHARD MANT, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore, Sixth Edition.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS edition of Bishop Mant's Prayer Book is brought within a very moderate compass, and appears to be very well executed. We are glad to see the labours of this useful ritualist continue to be so justly appreciated. It should be, of course, in every clergyman's library.

VIII.—*A Catechism on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, for the Use of the Church Schools. By the Rev. E. J. PHIPPS, B.A., Rector of Devizes.* London: Masters.

THIS little work contains a series of questions for school-children on all the books of the Bible; and appears to be well executed. We should think the plan suggested by Mr. Phipps calculated to promote an intelligent study of the sacred volume by children.

IX.—*The Wedding Gift; or, a Devotional Manual for the Married, or those Intending to Marry. By WILLIAM EDWARD HEYGATE, M.A.* London: Rivingtons.

A VERY excellent little Manual of advice and devotions on the subject of Marriage. It contains chapters on these subjects—Considerations before Marriage—Preparation for Marriage—Solemnization of Matrimony—Early Married Life—Married Life—and Devotions.

X.—*Daily Steps towards Heaven; or, Practical Thoughts on the Gospel History, and especially on the Life and Teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. For Every Day in the Year, according to*

*the Christian Seasons. With Titles and Characters of Christ; and a Harmony of the Four Gospels. Second Edition.* London: J. W. Parker.

A WORK of this kind supplies a want that has been long felt. Within the compass of a very small volume the Christian will here find pious thoughts for every day in the year, grounded on Holy Scripture. A work of this kind is much preferable to translations from books of Romish devotion, which almost always retain some tinge of doctrine that is objectionable.

XI.—*Brief Outline of the Study of Theology, drawn up to serve as the Basis of Introductory Lectures. By the late Dr. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER. To which are prefixed Reminiscences of Schleiermacher, by Dr. F. LÜCKE. Translated from the German by WILLIAM FARRER, LL.B.* Edinburgh: Clark.

THE chief interest of this volume is the Reminiscences of Dr. Lücke; for the Outline of the Study of Theology is so brief and so obscure, that it is of very little value. Schleiermacher was the originator of the design of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed in one communion, without any attempt to interfere with their respective doctrines. Dr. Lücke thus relates the origin of the design which was afterwards carried out by the king of Prussia.

“His reformatory activity was directed at a very early period towards the circumstances and the necessities of the Church’s life as a whole. His first publication in connexion with this subject consists of ‘Two Non-prejudicative Opinions in matters connected with the Interests of the Protestant Church; with a more immediate reference to the Prussian State’ (1804). This document was written about the time when he had finished his profoundly thoughtful work on the Criticism of the Doctrine of Morals. It appeared without his name; but it bore the impress of his mind. In the first Opinion, which relates to the separation of the two Protestant Churches, the ecclesiastical life-question of his mind, the Union, already makes its appearance, as clearly and definitely as possible. He points out the mischiefs of the separation hitherto existing: how, in relation to the religious interest, it nourishes superstition on the one hand, and, on the other, indifference towards even the essentials of religion; then, moreover, how it also operates injuriously in relation to general morality and true culture; and again, lastly, how, in relation to the State and the school, it also shows itself as an evil which it is high time to remedy. All this is worked out in a manner distinguished as much by the truthfulness of lively experience, as by genius and wit. But Schleiermacher did not content himself with complaining of the evil; even then, along with the necessity



of the Union, he also pointed out the proper manner of its *accomplishment*: he demanded that the *fellowship* of the Churches should be restored, without touching the differences in the system of *doctrine* or the variations in the *ritual*, and insisted that this restoration should be effected without circumscribing the liberty of faith and action of any individual. Even at that time, he called attention to the fact, that in the community of the United Brethren this idea of Union was realized in a satisfactory manner."

We have, further on, the following account of Schleiermacher's exertions and labours in the cause of the Union:—

"It was but for a short time that he was permitted to take part in the general government of the Church in one of the higher spiritual offices connected with the State. It was at that season of the regeneration of the Prussian State, when those ministers of powerful intellect, Von Stein and Wilhelm Von Humboldt, were seeking, in every department, to place the most able men at the head of affairs, and when, accordingly, Schleiermacher also could not fail of finding his place. I do not know in what manner, nor to what extent, he exercised an influence at that period in connexion with the reform of the Church. But this I know, that he willingly withdrew from the position, when, subsequently, the troublesome quickness and decision of his mind met with more of simple resistance than of positive effect. After this he confined himself to aiding, according to his ability, partly as a writer, and partly as the freely elected President of the Berlin Synod, in promoting the conduct, upon the right basis and in the right way, of the reform of public worship and the constitution of the Church (which had been agitated, especially since the year 1814, even in the *highest* quarter); and, along with this, of the Union. To this period belongs the series of his *occasional* publications relative to ecclesiastical affairs,—chiefly of a polemical character, and commencing with the celebrated "Letter of Congratulation to the Very Reverend the Members of the Commission appointed by his Majesty the King of Prussia for the purpose of preparing new Liturgical Forms" (1814). The anonymous guise of this work did not prevent the instant discovery of the author; so completely does it bear the impress of his mind. Rather a condolence and warning than a congratulation, and not wanting in a certain degree of irony, it was nevertheless received by the Commission with more than kindness. One might almost say that none of Schleiermacher's writings attained its end so immediately as this. The Commission, with noble self-denial, entered into the ideas of Schleiermacher; instead of precipitately constructing new liturgical forms, it proposed that a constitution should first be given to the Church, by means of which it should be possible to give to the needful reform, as proceeding from within outwardly, the character of a collective volition of the Church. It pertains to the imperishable renown of the King of Prussia, that he entered into this idea with all the interest of his Christian mind, and all the energy of his kingly

will. It is true, the new Liturgy for the Court and Garrison Congregation at Potsdam and the Garrison Church at Berlin was little adapted, even by the manner in which it was introduced, to give rise to the hope of a true, comprehensive reform, brought about in a proper way. Schleiermacher, like a watchman on the battlements of the Church, observant of every appearance and movement in the ecclesiastical horizon, did not omit—this time with the avowal of his name—with frankness, yet in a tone of mildness, to subject the new Liturgy to criticism, in his pamphlet ‘On the New Liturgy for the Court and Garrison Congregation at Potsdam (1816); and, at the close, to direct attention anew to this point,—‘that a well-ordered Synodal Constitution affords the only means of securing for the Church a legitimate co-operation towards the reform of Divine worship,—so that neither the caprice of the individual shall be able wildly to wander at pleasure in the sacred concerns of public worship, nor a fruitful and acknowledged point of union be wanting to the like-minded, who would fain enter into a mutual connexion,—nor the man of experience and of eminence be destitute of that silent, direct influence which it is proper for him to exercise. When, then, upon the occurrence of the jubilee of the Reformation in 1817, the King, by his praiseworthy example and excellent arrangements, prepared the way for, nay, in very strictness founded, the Union of the two Protestant Churches, and, as early as the spring of 1817, the official notification with regard to the formation of Presbyteries, and the union of the Protestant clergy into district, provincial, and national synods, made its appearance as the result. Schleiermacher’s rejoicing over the incipient success of his fairest and most cherished desires was equalled only by the zeal with which, by counsel and by deed, with love and diligence, he sought to promote and defend the new work. His ideas, in the mean time, had found entrance and patronage in more extended circles; a number of the clergy, especially the younger part of them, had come forward as follow-labourers and fellow-counsellors in the sacred enterprise. Schleiermacher, with thankfulness and modesty, cheerfully recognised this fact; devoid of envy, he rejoiced that he was neither the *only* labourer, nor, outwardly, the most important one. In order, however, that by the communication and discussion of his opinions and counsels with respect to certain particulars of the official notification just referred to, he might unite such as were like-minded to a deliberate and unanimous action at the Synods which were shortly to be held, he hastily stepped forth in advance, and wrote, as early as the summer of 1817, his ‘Observations concerning the Synodal Constitution about to be established for the Protestant Church of the State of Prussia.’—When, soon after this, the Berlin Synod assembled, and as a mark of honour elected him to be its president, he fulfilled the duties of this office with such zeal, such aptness, patience, and love, that even those who had, until then, rather feared and mistrusted him, began to bestow upon him their affection and confidence; so that the labours of the Synod evidently prospered under his guidance, through the increasingly lively harmony which pre-

veiled amongst its members. The union, and the new constitution of the Church, appeared at that time inseparable,—the one was the necessary auxiliary of the other. Thus, the first sign of life given by the Synod was its ‘Official Declaration respecting the Celebration of the Lord’s Supper, to be held by the Synod on the 30th of October.’ Schleiermacher was the author of this document. In it, he sets forth the union, in a brief and popular, a gentle and earnest manner, as a *purely ecclesiastical* pacification,—*unconnected* with any settlement of *dogmatical* differences, which would be useless, nay, would lead to new divisions,—and *testified* by means of a new and common ritual in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper.”

The great object of Schleiermacher’s Church policy was, to obtain freedom of action for the Church, to exempt it from the domination of the State. It is curious to find how men of the most opposite principles alike perceive the evils which the Church suffers from the suppression of its liberties by the temporal powers. The Rationalist and Latitudinarian of Germany, and the orthodox Churchman of England, equally feel it; and the State is every where jealous of the religious liberties of the people. We have the following account of the discussions relative to the Prussian Liturgy in Dr. Lücke’s pages:—

“But this was not the last conflict which our valiant combatant in the cause of the union and constitution of the Church had to sustain; others, incomparably more severe, were impending. No long time elapsed before the ecclesiastical horizon was enveloped in an exceedingly ominous gloom. To the statesmen of the old school the development of a more liberal constitution, and a more important position for the Church, was, from the very first, a source of great annoyance. The suspicion of a new *hierarchical* preponderance found utterance; at first in secret, but soon, also, aloud. Mistakes, exaggerations, remissness, and precipitation on the part of the theologians, gave a semblance of reason to the objection that the age was neither peaceful enough nor mature enough to allow of the Church’s having a constitution of greater vitality [than that to which it had been accustomed]. And as, in the department of political life, especially from the year 1819, something of crime and something of thoughtlessness, revolutionary giddiness, and the fantastic tricks of a superficial liberalism, called forth a necessary reaction, and a defensive solicitude and apprehensiveness with regard to every excitement of a free and lively character seemed almost to be but a part of the duty of caution and circumspection, it could not but be that, by degrees, in the ecclesiastical department also, preference should be given to the policy of stopping short and standing still, rather than to that of following up the movement which had been begun. This is not the place, nor is it possible for me, to set forth and to pass judgment upon the individual *momenta* of the reaction in ecclesiastical affairs, as they followed upon and in consequence of one another. Enough, the ap-



pearance of the new Prussian Liturgy and Agenda was the commencement and the signal of a new and, in part, opposite tendency, obstructive at once—at least in its immediate result—to the union and also to the constitution of the Church. Schleiermacher could not, in accordance with the principles of his practical theology, approve either the contents or the form of the new liturgical arrangements. He would have been untrue to his most inward and essential nature, if he had agreed to them; and it was a consequence involved in the energetic character of his mind, as well as in the nature of the position he had previously occupied, that he became the leader of the opposition. His pseudonymous publication, ‘On the Liturgical Right of Evangelical Sovereigns, a Theological Deliberation, by Pacificus Sincerus,’ (1824,) struck at the root of the opposite tendency, and stirred up anew the controversy respecting the principles of law involved in the connexion between Church and State; a controversy which, in the age of indifference, had almost been laid to sleep amongst the theologians, and had merely dragged along a wretched and spiritless existence in the schools of the jurists. The consequence has been, that since that time there has also arisen in this department, amongst theologians and jurists, a more lively intercourse and conflict of diverse tendencies and opinions. In appearance the noble hero was vanquished. The opposite tendency has, *practically*, obtained the upper hand. But that its supremacy is, I might say, merely *interimistic*, and that its theory, half out of fright at the consistent, logical development of itself in the writings of Augusti and others upon this subject, and half from a consciousness of the power of truth arrayed on the other side, becomes increasingly *modified*, relaxes, and concedes, until, perhaps, a point has been found in which the true medium is situated,—this is the work of the man who so long and so steadfastly maintained and led the opposition; until so much had been conceded on the other part, that he thought he could not, without doing violence to the claims of truth and love, delay any longer at least a cessation of hostilities.”—pp. 68—70.

Schleiermacher was one of that large class of thinkers in the present day who are of opinion that all religious opinions ought to be tolerated in the Christian Church; and therefore, of course, that all creeds and confessions of faith, and all obligations of believing any distinctive doctrine, should be removed. This system has been realized in the so-called Prussian Evangelical Church, which Schleiermacher suggested; and the result of this mixture of faith with unbelief is, that the mass of the community have no religion at all.

XII.—*Reflections of the Past, and Shadows of the Future. A Book for the New Year. By the Author of “Daniel the Prophet.”* Dublin: Hodges and Smith.

A SERIES of pious meditations, which cannot fail to benefit the

reader. Their subjects are not connected by any chain of thought, but appear to be the outpourings of a devotional and contemplative mind.

XIII.—*The Theory of Baptism. The Regeneration of Infants in Baptism Vindicated on the Testimony of Holy Scripture, Christian Antiquity, and the Church of England. By the Rev. GEORGE CROLY, LL.D., Rector of the United Parishes of St. Stephen, Walbrook, and St. Benet, London.* London: Rivingtons.

DR. CROLY'S abilities and learning are as well known as his uncompromising attachment to the principles of the Reformation. The testimony of such a writer, therefore, in behalf of the true doctrines of Baptism, is of very high importance, and deserves a proportionate attention. In the preface to his work he states his object to be that of furnishing an original treatise on Baptism, comprised within a moderate compass, and avoiding the bitterness of controversy. He remarks on the necessity of vigilance on the part of the Church, in consequence of the sudden rise of dissension on this vitally important subject, and he remarks on the evils attending such a mixed tribunal as the Privy Council consists of:—

“Without denying,” says Dr. Croly, “that it may have the due feeling for spiritual difficulties; that it may acquire the due knowledge for spiritual questions; that it may exhibit the due impartiality in the midst of conflicting interests; and may apply itself to its repulsive task with a zeal which seems to turn law into a formality, and leave decisions behind; still the constitution of such a tribunal places the Church in difficulty. Standing before that court, it loses a privilege conceded to the lowest condition of defence—it cannot challenge its jury. The time may thus come, in the possibilities of the future, when a mixed tribunal may be the very last to which, with safety of conscience, or in the exercise of a sound discretion, the Church would submit its cause; when it might see a Socinian deciding on a Trinitarian doctrine—a Presbyterian on Episcopacy—an Independent on Church discipline—or an avowed unbeliever on the whole system of Revelation.

“If we are told that this is but like a trial before the Bench in Westminster Hall, an answer is, that the judges are more trained to jurisprudence; that they have a professional character to maintain, and a professional penalty to fear; that they cannot escape from the results of error, or throw up their responsibility with their commission. The inherent evil of all temporary judicatures is their intangible nature; while retribution attempts to grasp them, they are gone: public opinion, the Nemesis of our day, has no wings to follow a phantom.”

Dr. Croly subsequently proceeds to criticise the judgment of

the Privy Council with his usual ability, and takes occasion to observe that, if there are Clergy who omit in the Baptismal service those parts in which infant regeneration is pronounced, they ought to resign their charges; and he is by no means fearful of the effect if they should altogether leave us.

“If fears are felt that the withdrawal of all who are thus tainted would weaken the Church, the fear is groundless. The strength of the Church is in its sincerity. The relief of its incumbrance would be only an increase of its vigour; the amputation of the decayed limb would give new health to the frame. What the establishment lost in numbers, it would gain in the most important of all possessions—character. Even those who withdrew would gain in character; the pardon which we must now refuse to their tergiversation, we might then give to their independence.”

We cordially concur with Dr. Croly in these sentiments. Disloyal members of the Church, whatever may be their views, never add to its strength. We are unhappily burdened with many such. Dr. Croly thus points out the evils of the present times:—

“The true danger of our day is the restlessness of opinion. The ‘right of private judgment’ is the charter of Protestantism; but the truth of obscure petulance, the rashness of ignorance, or the mere vanity of being notorious for the mischief which the meanest faculties have the power to inflict on the community, have often created mighty evils, even in the firm-set and guarded mind of England.

“The real object of dread ought to be the possibility of addition to the mass of schism, which already overlays and corrupts so large a portion of the spiritual fertility of England. Every sect finds a reception in our day; every dreamer can find an audience for his rhapsodies; every rambling performer on popular credulity can ‘do great wonders, and make fire come down from heaven on the earth,’ in the sight of men.”

Space does not permit us to enter on Dr. Croly’s argument in reference to Baptism; but it is well worthy the attention of the theological student.

XIV.—*A History of the Holy Eastern Church. Part I., General Introduction. By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., Warden of Sackville College, East Grinstead.* London: Masters.

THE two large volumes before us constitute only the Introduction of Mr. Neale’s History of the Eastern Church. We can very well believe the author when he speaks of them as the result of the more or less continuous labour of between five and six years. Years very soon pass away in the composition of works like this. The Introductory Part here presented to the public describes the rites, offices, faith, and customs of the Eastern Church.



The first book of the Introduction refers to the Geography of the Eastern Church. In preparing this, Mr. Neale has experienced great difficulties, for the want of trustworthy information. He complains of the inaccuracy of the older writers, such as Carolus a Sancto Paulo, and the *Notitiæ* given by Leunclavius, Goar, and Bingham. He mentions the case of the *Notitiæ* of one province in Bingham, in which fourteen names out of thirty are more or less wrong. His chief authority is Le Quien's *Oriens Christianus*; but he has applied to more modern sources of information. Of the Patriarchates of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and Russia, of Armenia, and the catholicate of Chaldea, his list is official and complete: that of Constantinople is not official, and is, therefore, imperfect, while he has been unable to obtain any account of the Jacobite Patriarchate of Antioch, and the Metranate of Ethiopia. The labour bestowed upon the details of this work must have been enormous. Those lists of bishoprics, which stand so neatly arranged in parallel columns, have cost an immensity of labour; and all kinds of information, ancient and modern, are collected for the benefit of the reader; and then the ecclesiology of the Oriental Church, which forms another portion of this work, is really most curious and interesting. We are here made acquainted with the oldest existing remains of Christian antiquity. The architectural style, too, is so very unlike any thing we have ever seen or read of in the West, and yet in some cases so rich and solemn. The work contains a number of plans of ancient Oriental Churches, and illustrations very beautifully executed. Minute details are given of the ecclesiastical vestments used in the East, with illustrations.

After this, Mr. Neale examines the Liturgies of the East, arranged under their great heads—Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Edessa. The latter head is one of Mr. Neale's own devising. He argues that the Nestorian Liturgy of the Apostles must have been an Apostolic liturgy, and he remarks that Mr. Palmer's opinion appears not to be sufficiently founded. There may not perhaps be any very conclusive force in Mr. Palmer's arguments on the subject; but we confess that we do not think Mr. Neale has established the point *he* contends for, because he has not adduced any direct evidence of quotations in ancient writers to show the ancient existence of this rite, but appears to depend upon the assumption, that one of the Liturgies of the Nestorians is older than another; and this appears to us by no means certain. We should be glad to see the subject further inquired into; but at present we do not feel convinced by Mr. Neale's reasoning.

After this the Liturgies themselves are given at great length, with copious and learned explanatory notes, and dissertations on different subjects related to the Liturgies. This takes up by far the greater portion of the Introduction. The Calendars of the Eastern Churches are treated of at great length; and we know not where the information here given could be found, except in this book. An elaborate dissertation on the office-books of the East is appended; and the various sacraments and rites are detailed at great length with much learning. On the whole, we must express our admiration of the research, and indefatigable industry of the author, and our high sense of the addition he has made to our theological literature in this very learned publication.

xv.—*Ordination, Matrimony, Vectigalia, and Extreme Unction, theologically considered. Dedicated to all who revere Supreme Authority in Church and State, as vested in our Most Gracious Sovereign the Queen, Defender of the Faith. By the Rev. DANIEL P. M. HULBERT, M.A., Priest in Holy Orders, and Member of the Senate of Cambridge.* London: Painter.

THE title of this publication is rather singularly drawn up; and it may in some degree serve to indicate the principles of the author, who is a strong opponent of schism in all shapes, and denounces the Dissenter as having never had the succession, and the Romanist as having lost it by idolatry. The author is very far indeed from what is called "mock modesty," or an under estimate of his own powers and abilities. He appears to consider the publication of these papers, with the avowal of his name, long concealed, as an event of no inconsiderable importance.

"In obedience," he says, "to the wishes of friends, who have been aware of my having for many years (over six years) contributed anonymously to very many weekly (and other) publications for the wealth of the country, I have at last revealed my name; conceiving, moreover, that reference to circumstances affecting some of my past ministrations, and departed associates and acquaintances, rather required a revelation of the author of the following four treatises. Yet, had I consulted my own inclination and comfort, 'as unknown yet well known' would have far better suited my views. But if the author of the 'Epistle to the Hebrews,' or the 'Acts of the Apostles,' some man might say, thought fit to suppress his own name, might not these Essays have done as much good in their day as do those books in successive generations, although wise men have often fought about the respective authors," &c.

The author argues in reply, that it is evident from experience, how much discussion and inconvenience have arisen from suppressing the names of the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews

or the Acts; or, in later times, of the Poems of Ossian, and the Letters of Junius. So that he leaves us to infer, that he acts for the good of his brethren, in relieving them from the anxiety which they may hereafter be liable to suffer, if the authorship of certain articles in Periodicals were not made known. We are sure the public will thank the author for his kind intentions. The only thing that will occur to most men will be, how profound must be their ignorance, in never before having heard of these articles, or of their reverend author; and we are concerned to own, that we are ourselves in this distressing predicament. "Vectigalia" is made to take rather a wide range, as it includes a plan for paying off the National Debt.

- xvi.—1. *Remarks on the Architecture of Llandaff Cathedral, with an Essay towards a History of the Fabric.* By EDWARD A. FREEMAN, M.A., &c. London: Pickering.
2. *A Letter to the Lord Bishop of Llandaff on the peculiar Condition and Wants of the Diocese.* By THOMAS WILLIAMS, M.A., Archdeacon of Llandaff. London: J. W. Parker.

THE publications before us afford gratifying evidence of the exertions which are being made in the diocese of Llandaff to promote the efficiency of the Church. The cathedral of this diocese has, from a variety of causes, fallen into a very sad state of decay, the nave having been in the course of the last century unroofed, and the rest of the building disfigured by tasteless and injurious innovations. It is very cheering to find that the work of restoration, in good taste, has been commenced and is progressing; for, although Llandaff itself appears to be a place of no importance, still it conveys a very unfavourable impression of the efficiency of a Church, to see its principal edifices in ruin; and the residence of the bishop, the works now in progress at the cathedral, and the exertions making to extend the Church cause in the diocese, all afford proofs of improvement and of life, which will operate beneficially on every Churchman in South Wales, and lead him to feel more attachment to his Church. We do not like the tone of Mr. Freeman's remarks on subjects connected with the Reformation: they are more or less tinged with the views of those who look on the Reformation as an evil, and speak unfavourably of it on all occasions. We cannot avoid entering our protest against such views, and more especially when we remember the practical effects which this system of talking and insinuation has had.

The letter published by Archdeacon Williams discloses the fearful inadequacy of means in the hands of the Church to meet the spiritual wants of the people of South Wales. The increase



of population in the diocese of Llandaff is enormous, and the numbers of clergy and churches wholly inadequate. The first step, however, to remedy these evils, is to ascertain their extent, and Archdeacon Williams has done this. We rejoice to hear that further efforts are making, to which every one must wish success.

XVII.—*Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts. Forming the Second Series of Sacred and Legendary Art.* By Mrs. JAMESON. London: Longman and Co.

THE volume before us comprises short biographies of all the principal saints and founders of monastic orders, and of eminent personages connected with them, with a view to the illustration of paintings and other works of art referring to such subjects. It is richly illustrated by Mrs. Jameson, like her other works. Of course, we are not to look for strict accuracy of historical detail in a work like this, which is intended for popular use. We have been, on the whole, satisfied with what we have seen of the tone of the author, and the general treatment of the subject, while in some places we have observed slight inaccuracies in history.

XVIII.—*The Church and the People.* By the Rev. CHRISTOPHER ROBINSON, B.A., Curate of Audenshaw. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co.

THIS little volume was written with the object of meeting all the popular objections against the Church of England raised by Dissenters in the manufacturing districts. It appears to us to be very well executed; and it is written in a tone of genuine loyalty to the Church. We should think it would be extremely useful for parochial lending libraries, and generally for circulation in parishes where dissent exists.

XIX.—*A Selection of Psalms and Hymns.* By the Rev. H. K. CORNISH, Vicar of Bakewell. London: Mozleys.

FROM all we have seen of this collection it appears to be well and carefully made; but we cannot help expressing regret at the present state of things, which gives to each clergyman the power of publishing a book of Psalms and Hymns for the use of his own church. The effect is, to prevent a stranger from joining in the psalmody, unless by chance some one should lend him a copy of the Psalter in use in that church. It is also very possible that a new clergyman may introduce a new collection of Psalms or

Hymns. All this is very inconvenient. It were much to be wished that a short collection of the best and most popular Hymns should be always printed with the new Version of the Psalms in our Prayer Book. Surely this might be easily managed by some arrangement between the Universities and the Christian Knowledge Society. It would be a very great benefit if such a collection were to be found in all Prayer Books, so that every one should be provided with the words of some, at least, of the hymns sung in any church he might attend.

xx.—*The Philosophy of Spirits in relation to Matter: showing the real Existence of two very different kinds of Entity, &c.* By C. M. BURNETT, M.D. London: Highley.

DR. BURNETT has bestowed deep thought and research on the mysterious and difficult subject to which he has directed his attention; and we have been interested and instructed by all we have read of his book. He assumes the authority of revelation as the basis of his inquiries; and we, therefore, need not add, that they are conducted in a reverential and a Christian spirit. The phenomena of Mesmerism he identifies with the ancient magic, and ascribes to the influence of the devil. He, of course, admits the reality.

xxi.—*Letters to Young People.* By the late WALTER AUGUSTUS SHIRLEY, D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man. London: Hatchards.

THIS little volume contains a selection of the letters of the late Bishop Shirley, addressed to members of his own family and other young people. They have, for the most part, been already published in the Memoirs of this pious and excellent man. Although the atmosphere of thought and opinion to which these letters introduce us is somewhat peculiar, we must yet admit the substantial excellence of much of what we find here; and all we have perused of the volume has instructed and edified us not a little. Bishop Shirley would, without doubt, have been a blessing to his diocese, had he been spared.

xxii.—*Leisure Hours in a Country Parsonage; or, Strictures on Men, Manners, and Books.* By the Rev. J. K. ROBINSON, Prebendary of Whitechurch, Diocese of Ferns. Dublin: M'Glashan.

THIS work comprises a series of Essays on a great many amusing and interesting subjects, such as, "The Petty Jealousies and Envyings of a Country Neighbourhood," "Female Dress," "The Theatre," "The Effects of Residence in France," &c. As far as

we have been enabled to judge, these Essays are very well executed,—something in the style of the “Spectator” and “Rambler.” They contain much good sense, and in point of principle are very “old-fashioned;” the author appearing to hold what were esteemed good, sound, Protestant, *i. e.* Church of England Protestant principles, forty or fifty years ago.

XXIII.—*A Score of Lyrics.* Cambridge: Macmillan. London: Pickering.

WE took up this little volume with an involuntary feeling of something like impatience at the remembrance of the innumerable disappointments we have experienced in perusing new volumes of poetry; but, as we read, our attention became arrested by much which really deserves the name of poetry—much which has really gratified us, and which proves the writer to be possessed of powers which afford promise of still higher excellence. We quote the following lines as a specimen from “Westward, ho!”—

“But, alas! Old England’s prime is flown,  
 ’Tis merry now no more,  
 Where the land is growing to one vast town,  
 Where they fence the copse and mete the moor,  
 And, spurned from all, save the prison-door,  
 A man needs flee, for place there is none  
 Where he might be free and poor.  
 “Then, hey! for a life wild, uncontrolled,  
 In prairies yet untrod!  
 Where the hand that’s strong, with a heart that’s bold,  
 Has nobler work than to delve the clod,  
 Or cringe ’neath laws at rich men’s nod,  
 Repealing Nature’s fiat old,  
 And stinting the gifts of God.”

After all, perhaps, notwithstanding the enclosure of commons, and the poor-law unions, there are some advantages still remaining in Old England. There are many disadvantages certainly; but is there nothing to be apprehended from the scalping-knife of the savage, or the rifle of the squatter? Every one to his taste, however.

XXIV.—*Readings for the Aged.* By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, M.A., &c. London: Masters.

THIS work consists of a series of lectures for the various seasons of the Christian year, which the author prepared in the course of his duty as ministering to aged and infirm persons. He states that these lectures were understood by those to whom they were



addressed. This is a great point. We have been pleased with all we have seen of the volume: it is interspersed with anecdotes, and, like all Mr. Neale's works, is extremely well written.

xxv.—“*Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Book of Revelation?*” *An Essay by* CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., &c. London: Rivingtons.

THIS little volume contains a careful and learned survey of the very important question on which it treats. We have never seen the subject so clearly and ably treated, and in such a short compass, nor do we see how it is possible to resist the force of Dr. Wordsworth's argument.

xxvi.—*Remains of the late Rev. HENRY FRANCIS LYTE, M.A., Incumbent of Lower Brixham, Devon; with a Prefatory Memoir by the Editor.* London: Rivingtons.

How little does the world know of the virtues, and the high intellectual attainments, which in many a sequestered corner are employed in the service of the Church! We have here before us the biography of a man who was calculated to fill a far more distinguished sphere than that in which his lot was cast; yet it is now for the first time that the world gains any acquaintance with this admirable man. The memoir is beautifully written, and presents to us a most touching picture of ministerial faithfulness. The poems included in the volume show very high power and accomplishment of mind. We must quote the following beautiful lines:—

“What strains are those, what sweet familiar numbers  
From old Ierne o'er the waters wind?

How welcome wakening from its lengthen'd slumbers,  
Sounds the heart-music of my earliest friend!

Well might that hand amid the chords have falter'd,  
That voice have lost the power to melt and move:

How pleasant, then, to find them still unalter'd,  
That lyre in sweetness, and that heart in love!

“Ah me! what thoughts those few bold notes awaken,—  
Bright recollections of life's morning hours;

Haunts long remembered, and too soon forsaken;  
Days that fled by in sunshine, song, and flowers;

Old Clogher's rocks, our own sequester'd valley;  
Wild walks by moonlight on the sounding shore,

Hearts warm and free, light laugh, and playful sally,  
All that has been, and shall return no more.

"No more—no more—moods ever new and changing,  
 Feelings that forth in song so freely gush'd,  
 Wing'd hopes, high fancies, thoughts unfetter'd ranging—  
 Flowers which the world's cold plough-share since has crush'd.  
 Dear early visions of departed gladness,  
 Ye rise, ye live a moment in that strain,  
 A gleam of sunshine on life's wintry sadness,  
 Ah! why so bright, to flit so soon again?"

XXVII.—*The Churchman's Diary: an Almanack for the year of Grace, 1851.* London: Masters.

PERSONS who put forward almanacks of this kind are really incurring a heavy responsibility, in giving offence to many weak brethren, and in causing the way of truth to be evil spoken of. It commences with what is called a "Directory for the celebration of Divine Services," in which the following principles are laid down: 1. That, as the chancels are to "remain as in times past," the clergy and choir "shall have their places there and no one else;"—that "the whole service (unless portions are 'sung') should be 'said,' *i. e.* intoned or recited musically on a single note;"—that the sentences at the beginning should be regarded as antiphons, and that they should be arranged for the seasons; 'repent ye' and 'enter not' being for Advent, and so on;—that there are "*Ferial* days," as in the Roman ritual;—that "as there is one altar so there can be but one priest (acting in that capacity), whose place is to stand *at, i. e.* in front of the altar, at the north side, facing south-east;"—that, "in consecrating the elements, the priest should be careful *to lift them up*, so that the people may see;"—that the services for the state holidays "have not received the consent of Convocation; and should therefore *not be used*." The calendar contains not only the usual English festivals and saints' days, but those which were "provided for the Church of Scotland by Archbishop Laud." In the calendar, we find in February 1, "the *flowers* should be removed from churches this morning;" March 5, "if any person be unable to keep the fast of Lent *strictly*, he should apply to his parish priest for *direction*." April 20, "It is an ancient and pious custom, on this and other chief festivals, to decorate churches, and especially altars, with *flowers*." June 26, "Remove Easter decorations." July 7, We find the festival of "the Translation of St. Thomas of Canterbury," and December 29, the feast of "St. Thomas of Canterbury, Archbishop and Martyr," re-inserted in the calendar, though it has never been authorized since the Reformation.

We have directions as to the size of the altar: "as a general rule, it should not be less than six feet in length and four feet

high." If there are several sets of vestments, *white* is to be used at some seasons, *red* at others, *violet* on other occasions, *black* on special days, *green* on all other days; the colours and seasons being regulated, we apprehend, by the rubric of the Roman Missal.

Now, without meaning to express any strong condemnation of every particular detail noted above, we must express very deep regret at the whole, inasmuch as we have here a Directory introducing a number of rites, forms, and observances, which are unauthorized by the ritual of the English Church, and which approximate more or less to Romanism. From the mode in which directions are given, a reader, who was not on his guard, might suppose that the various observances here prescribed or recommended have the authority of the Church of England in their favour.

xxviii.—*The Revelation of Jesus Christ, explained agreeably to the Analogy of the Holy Scripture.* By a CLERGYMAN. London: Masters.

As far as we can judge, the author of this interpretation does not vary essentially, *i.e.* in the *great* features of his system, from other Protestant expositors. At the same time we observe that he professes peculiar views, and views which will not be accepted generally, *e.g.* he supposes the Angel speaking to St. John to be one of the Prophets of the Church—a human being like St. John himself. He also inclines to expect, with the Mormonites and Irvingites, the restoration of a fourfold ministry, of which the Apostleship will be the first rank. The work appears to us to be rather obscure in point of style, and it presents less indications of research than we are accustomed to expect in commentaries on the Apocalypse in these days. It is really astonishing to observe the multiplicity of new publications on this subject, no one appearing to be satisfied with the explanations which have been hitherto given; and yet they are for the most part very much alike in material points. There is much peculiarity of thought in the fifth part of this book, in reference to the Reformation.

xxix.—*A Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Ashley, M.P., on the Alleged Romish Tendency of the Younger Clergy.* By WILLIAM JOHN EDGE, M.A., *Perpetual Curate of Hartshill, Warwickshire.* London: John W. Parker, West Strand. 1850.

AMIDST the thousand and one waifs of the present hour, launched from as many sources, floating about on the billows of popular emotion, we have been especially struck with this one, which has a definite aim most happily embodied. It is designed to teach



all good "evangelicals" (so called) charity and tenderness for their younger high-church brethren; and we venture most sincerely to recommend it for general circulation with this view. It is eloquently, indeed we might say, beautifully written; but it is the *spirit* of the pamphlet which most delights us, so thoroughly Catholic and Christian. It cannot fail to work extensive good, wherever known. We cite one passage, addressed, remember, to Lord Ashley:—

"Can you desire the return of that disgraceful negligence which rendered our national church a scandal to her true friends, and the scorn and laughing-stock of her enemies? Would you recall the age of deserted churches—deserted by the people, because forsaken by the priest,—when two services on the Lord's Day were, even in large towns, the exception rather than the rule, when the poor were virtually banished from the services of the Church, not by crowded congregations of their superiors, but by appropriated and dragon-guarded pews,—when our glorious Liturgy was degraded into a cold and lifeless dialogue between the officiating clergyman and a blundering clerk, for the edification of a few mute and scattered auditors, *moping* in their huge and dreary pews, like pelicans in the wilderness or owls in the desert? Would you recall the age of rare communions and rarer communicants, of private baptisms and domestic churchings, of careless pastors and neglected flocks,—that age, the monuments of which are visible in every parish, in those ungainly Temples of Dissent, to which the disgusted children of the Church were driven from a cold and deadening formalism? I anticipate your reply.—'God forbid,' I hear you say, 'that such simplicity should return.' From this scandalous laxity the Church was aroused by the fervent piety of the Herveys and Romaines, the Cecils, the Newtons, and the Scotts of the last century. I thank God, my Lord, for the ministrations of these holy men; nay, even for the zealous labours of Whitfield and Wesley; and I most heartily wish that their zeal had been directed (as it might easily have been) to the edification rather than the weakening of the Church of England! The 'Evangelical' movement of the last century was indeed an infusion of fresh life into the paralyzed and torpid Church. It aroused many sleeping souls into activity; its authors served God in their generation, and are now blessed for evermore! But it had its faults. Its prevalent Calvinism cramped it, and hung like an incubus about it, rendering its system exclusive and anomalous; *exclusive* in its virtual excommunication of the great body of the people, and *anomalous* in its contradiction to the comprehensive spirit and language of the Prayer Book. Its exclusiveness gives it the semblance of severity and bigotry, and thus rendered it repulsive to enlarged and generous minds."

Then, after an admirable passage on the workings of this system, we read:—

"There are, my Lord, many sincere and hearty Protestants, who see

and lament the faults and deficiencies of that religious movement of the last age, who, nevertheless, love, and endeavour to develope, its virtues, and to leaven it with the spirit and doctrine of the Prayer Book. At the present juncture these men are, by the thoughtless and ill-informed, confounded with the Romanizers, because they happen to hold in common with them the distinctive doctrines of the Church, and agree with them, to a certain point, in wishing to give efficiency and solemnity to the public offices of religion. I lift my feeble voice in behalf of these men, as one who endeavours, and always has endeavoured, to be one of them; and let me add my conviction, that they constitute the majority of the younger clergy of England."

A feeble voice you do not lift, Mr. Edge; but a strong and a sweet one. Such writing, so truthful, so generous-hearted, so free from the slightest taint of party-spite or bitterness, we do not meet with every day. Mr. Edge's pamphlet, we repeat, must work extensive good. We would gladly cite the whole of it in our pages, but, as we cannot do this, must content ourselves with recommending it most strongly. We were acquainted with this author before. His baptismal tracts pleased us much; and his "Vision of Peace" is decidedly a beautiful poem, and one that will *live*, though only published in the form of a pamphlet; but this present Letter confers a real benefit on all sound Churchmen, far and near.

xxx.—*Eidolon, or the Course of a Soul; and other Poems.* By WALTER R. CASSELS. London: Pickering.

A NEW and pretentious versifier. Mr. Cassels *aims* at great things, but he does not *perform*. He is vague and diffuse, almost wholly wanting in true beauty, and, what is worst of all, he almost always chirps a parrot-strain! For instance, here we have Tennyson, and "the Lord of Burleigh:"—

"She had suitors many, many,  
The fair Lady Annabel;  
But she loved him more than any,  
For she knew he loved her well."

This gentleman is always writing about aristocratic ladies falling in love with poetic young gentlemen of lowly origin: that is one of *the* themes of the day. Marston has written three or four tragedies about it, and Mrs. Browning one beautiful poem; so of course Mr. Cassels must "say his say" too. Well, here again is Mrs. Browning at second hand,—we need not say an indifferent copy,—all the grace and beauty of the original departed:—

“O, poor world! immersed in folly; O, dull world! that will not  
hearken

To the music of a poet singing of the beautiful,  
Close your heart against its teaching, though it be so sweet, and  
darken

All the sunshine of the spirit by the coldness of your rule!”

Here is weak moonshine aping sunlight; or would not even the image of a farthing candle seem more appropriate? We are severe, but not unjustly so. We cannot away with these mocking-birds' songs: they vex us past endurance: in themselves they are most wearisome; but it is their effect which is so utterly deplorable in disgusting the public with poetry, and causing the true bards, whom these bardlings imitate, to be confounded with them in popular estimation. Here lies the mischief! As the song says,—

“Amidst the noisy cuckoo's cries  
The linnet hear but few;  
*And all these false realities  
Now nearly hide the true.*”

Then Mr. Cassels gives us a long production “à la Keats,” entitled “Alceste,” in which he tells over again, coarsely and badly, what Leigh Hunt has told so well before him in his charming “Legend of Florence.” Here is originality for you, dear reader, who know and love Keats's “Isabella” (“Alceste,” p. 109):—

“The tresses rustling on her neck, and she  
A woman meek, and tender as a dove;  
Yet to her full heart stricken utterly;  
And, as she went, her moist eyes turn'd above,  
Sighing, ‘Poor Julian, Heaven have care of thee,  
And grant thee mercy for thy hapless love!’  
She said no more, but 'twas a piteous thing  
To see a helpless maid so sorrowing.”

Now we affirm that Mr. Cassels has no right to desecrate our memories in this manner. We must have forgotten “Alceste” before we can again enjoy with keen delight the plaintive “Isabella,” and the matchless “Eve of St. Agnes.” Then for “Eidolon,” the great achievement, ninety-two pages of weary blank-verse, with here and there a pleasing image, but scarce a new *idea*, and the most wearisome iteration. Man or woman who has not the faculty of concentration has no right to versify! Conceive this kind of thing,—we take the first passage that comes to hand,—continued for several thousand lines! (p. 19):—



" Then, as an eagle flieth to his crag  
 High in the stillness of the dim cloud-land,  
 Fled I from man into the trackless woods  
 To sate my soul with quietude and song.  
 Then, too, ye saw me, ye pure orbs of heaven,  
 And sent your blessed radiance to my heart  
 In the still twilight of my calm content!  
 Then came an answer to the unseen voice—  
 ' O holy calmness of the inner soul!  
 Treasure of treasures! sweetness of all sense!  
 Athwart the smoothness of whose liquid tide,'"  
 &c. &c. &c.

Does any body see a prospect of an end to all this? Might it not flow on for ever to remote oblivion? The same dreary boundlessness characterizes that young gentleman, Mr. Sidney Yendy's outpourings in his "Roman:" when our eyes have dwelt for some few minutes on such musings, we are summoned back in fancy to past hours of fever-weariness, when the hot fit was succeeded by a vague wretchedness. Such is the general character we should ascribe to "Eidolon." Yet Mr. Cassels has the trick of writing, and at a first glance you might conceive his musings exceedingly sublime. Unfortunately, they are hollow and barren—as vacancy. We can find no fitter image. Much such another is the American Lewel, whom we have recently laboured to digest. He, too, has given us a long "Legend" like Keats, which would not be so bad, really, if no Keats had ever written: but, before you have read two verses, you detect the copy, and, if you then get through twenty more, we think you possessed of most heroic fortitude. We don't deny that there may be some little poetry in both these men, "at second hand:" but where is the good of that? They have both felt a little, and thought a little, and are thoroughly imbued with what is called "the spirit of the age," retailing all the oracular utterances of their elder brethren as fresh and genuine inspirations. We will not positively undertake to say that nothing can be in them. Only let them fully understand they have done nothing yet! If they can conceive or execute for themselves, we will grant them "a clear stage and no disfavour." Both have certainly a great power of talk; but, as it is, even if more wonderful, we could only say with Dr. Johnson, pronouncing on a lady's musical performance to a sitter-by,—  
 "Would it were *impossible*, Madam!" If these would-be bards are eagles indeed, they will soar upward despite the blast of our displeasure; if they are owls, kites, or mocking-birds, these too must have their day: "*Requiescant in pace!*"

XXXI.—*An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal. Being the substance of a Course of Lectures delivered to Candidates for Orders at St. David's College, Lampeter. By EDW. HAROLD BROWNE, M.A., Prebendary of Exeter, &c. Vol. I. London: J. W. Parker.*

FROM all we have seen of this work it appears to us amongst the most useful and the soundest publications of the day. The author proceeds to expound the Articles with a view to the contemporary errors against which they were directed,—a very necessary point, which has been too much overlooked in such expositions. His views are sound and moderate, his learning very extensive, and his references to works of English theology of standard merit copious. We have been highly gratified by all we have seen of this volume.

XXXII.—*A Selection from the Sermons and Poetical Remains of the Rev. GEORGE JAMES CORNISH, M.A., late Vicar of Kenwyn and Kea, &c. London: Mozley.*

THIS volume possesses a high interest as a memorial of a most excellent and revered clergyman, whose death appears to have been felt in the diocese of Exeter as a severe loss to the Church. The selection of Sermons and of Poems now before us proves sufficiently the high qualifications which he possessed as an able, eloquent, and edifying preacher; and the accomplishment of mind, refinement of taste, and poetical power, which must have shed a charm over his general character and conversation, are apparent in the beautiful pieces which adorn the volume. Of the Sermons we must say, that they are amongst the most interesting we have ever seen. Their style is peculiarly graceful and flowing, eminently the writing of one who viewed subjects under the mingled light of a poetic temperament and a mind deeply stored with scriptural thought and imagery. In doctrine they are most sound and orthodox, and we rise from their perusal with mingled feelings of regret that such a man should be no longer with us, and of thankfulness that he was so long permitted to be a blessing to the Church.

XXXIII.—*The Life of James Davies, a Village Schoolmaster. Written by Sir THOMAS PHILLIPS. London: Parker.*

A most striking piece of biography. This village schoolmaster's life ought to be in the hands of every member of the Church of England, high and low. We can recommend it as an invaluable book for a Parochial Lending Library. It is perfectly charming.

XXXIV.—*Sermons on Old Testament Histories. Selected from the*

*Parish Discourses of the late Ven. Archdeacon BATHER.* London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

WE are sure that the Christian Knowledge Society could not have taken a more desirable step than that of publishing, as they have done, a selection from Archdeacon Bather's Sermons. To that writer we owe one of our best works on Catechising; and his experience and success in parochial ministrations, the sound judgment and zeal which he always evinced, and the intimate terms on which he stood with all his people, render his addresses of peculiar value. They are just the sort of discourses which plain people can understand and relish; and we have no doubt that their circulation will be extensive, and will make the name of their venerable author as familiar to the poor of our Church as it is already to the clergy and to all persons of education.

xxxv.—*The New Testament, expounded and illustrated according to the usual marginal references in the very words of Holy Scripture. Together with the Notes and Translations, and a complete marginal Harmony of the Gospels.* By CLEMENT MOODY, M.A., &c. London: Longman and Co.

THE title-page of this book explains sufficiently its design. It comprises the marginal references arranged at the foot of the page at full length. We have no doubt that it will be found extremely convenient to the student of the Bible, and will tend to a more intelligent use of the sacred volume.

xxxvi.—1. *The Danger and the Foe. A Sermon, delivered in Trinity Church, Exeter.* By the Rev. ARCHER GURNEY. Exeter: Wallis. London: Masters.

2. *Union and Victory. A Sermon, by the same Author.*

AMONGST the various Discourses to which the late Papal aggression has given cause, these two Sermons by Mr. Gurney claim a distinguished place, from their assertion of strong Anti-papal principle, in combination with a manly effort to do justice to the clergy of Exeter who had been accused of Romanism by the enemies of the Church. These Discourses are the production of a generous and charitable spirit, which reserves its antagonism for the enemies of the faith. The facts referred to in these Sermons, as to the efforts made by the *Jesuits*, at the present time, to sow dissension between the clergy and laity of the Church of England, are most important.

xxxvii.—*The Old Paths of the Church of England. A Sermon preached in St. John's Chapel, St. Marylebone.* By DANIEL BUTLER, M.A., Assistant Minister. Rivingtons.

A VERY excellent discourse, pointing out the duty of Churchmen



in these days to adhere to a system which has antiquity and truth on its side, in opposition to the innovations of Dissent on the one side, and Romanism on the other. Its tone is remarkably calm and argumentative.

XXXVIII.—*Tales and Allegories*. Oxford and London: J. H. Parker. 1850.

THIS is one of the prettiest and most pleasing volumes that we have seen for a long while. The Tales and Allegories which it contains are already known to most of our readers, having previously appeared in the Parochial Tracts. We have never read a more attractive as well as instructive tale than that entitled "It might have been worse;" in which the style of a well-known and justly popular writer may easily be recognised, except that he has here quite surpassed himself. Amongst others that have particularly pleased us are, "Edwin Forth; or, the Emigrant in Canada;" "Harry Fulton; or, the Merchant's Son;" and "Thou shalt not Steal; or, the School Feast."

XXXIX.—*Old Christmas*. Oxford and London: J. H. Parker. 1850.

JUST what its name imports: admirably suited for children of eight or ten years old, and will be read with pleasure and profit by their parents.

XI.—*The Christian Year*. Thirty-eighth Edition. Oxford and London: J. H. Parker. 1850.

A POCKET edition of this very popular work: very well got up, and very cheap.

XLI.—*A Catechism on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*. By the Rev. JAMES BEAVEN, D.D., &c. Oxford and London: J. H. Parker.

DR. BEAVEN'S work, "A Help to Catechising," is probably well known to all our readers as amongst the most useful manuals on the subject of which it treats. The little work before us is written in the same style, and possesses in its way equal merit. The Articles, however, are not likely to be so much studied in schools as the Catechism; and the explanation which Dr. Beaven has here given is calculated for schools or for very young persons. It may, however, be useful to students in the Universities: indeed, we think it *will* be so: and we trust it may obtain the circulation which it certainly deserves. We should scarcely have said, as at page seventy, that the Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, against which the Twenty-second Article is directed, is not exactly known.

XLII.—*Eastbury: a Tale.* By ANNA HARRIET DRURY, *Authoress of Friends and Fortune.* London: Pickering.

WE have met with Miss Drury before: the placid grace of her poems surprised and delighted us, recalling Goldsmith, Crabbe, and Gray, yet marked with a peculiar feminine delicacy and refinement. Her poems did, indeed, greatly please us, and her tale of "Friends and Fortune" won from us a richly deserved encomium in the pages of this review. Therefore, late as is the hour and day on which we have received this, her last production, "Eastbury," we have hurriedly perused, in order to be able to say (as we honestly can), that it is worthy of its elder sisters or brothers. It is, take it for all in all, a very delightful story, though we are not sure that it is wholly equal to "Friends and Fortune." The subject is not, perhaps, as pleasing, and our attention is too much divided between two heroines, the least interesting of whom, to us most unexpectedly, obtains—but we must not tell any secrets, or mar the effect of *the surprise*—which, if most readers are as blind as we were, will prove great indeed. Miss Drury's style is peculiarly easy and agreeable; upon the whole, we prefer the lighter passages, thinking some of the more serious a little too ornate, and also too determinately "good;" but this is a fault on the right side, no doubt. Such a model of perfection in a young lady's eyes as the clerical hero surely never was realised on earth, such a combination of meekness and daring, of Fenelon and the admirable Crichton; but it is all very delightful, at all events. We do think him, however, slightly addicted to speechifying—but he is a noble parish-priest, and we only wish there were a thousand such,—“if wishers were choosers,” as the proverb says. One recommendation this tale has for us, it is a thorough Church of England book, free from all sentimental tamperings with Popery, and presenting us with an admirable model-bishop of our own. There is an interesting mystery connected with the more romantic heroine, Beatrice, and wild adventure is not wanting; but still we think the plot might have been managed more effectively. We presume the general moral may be held to be the necessity for telling the whole truth at whatever sacrifice; and better moral can be none. By the by, where did Miss Drury discover those very beautiful lines (pp. 216, 217), of which she speaks so slightly? To us they are unknown. "Eastbury" will bear reading more than once; we scarcely know of a more fitting birth-day gift.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

AMONGST the recent publications which have come under our notice are the following:—"Arctic Expeditions," a Lecture by Mr. Weld, Assistant Secretary of the Royal Society (Murray),

giving a brief and well-written account of the various expeditions to the Arctic seas; "The Merits and Tendencies of Free Trade and Protection," by Dr. Calvert (Hearne), recommending the storing of corn in seasons of plenty; "An Inquiry into M. D'Abbadie's Journey to Kaffa," by Dr. Beke (Madden), in which the author proves that M. D'Abbadie's journey is an invention; "The Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register" (Newhaven), a most admirably conducted American Theological Review, published quarterly; "The Bible of Every Land" (Bagster), a very curious and interesting account of all the versions of the Bible, with specimens of each version. We trust this important and expensive undertaking meets support. "The Blank-paged Bible" (Bagster), an extremely beautiful and complete Bible, with maps, marginal references, interleaved pages, and every thing which adapts it for the use of clergymen or students. A Sermon, by Mr. Watson, of Cheltenham, "The Church's own Action" (Masters), refers to the recent aggression, and is ably written. We have also Sermons on the same subject by the Rev. Nugent Wade, and Rev. H. D. Hilton; a strongly Anti-Tractarian Sermon, "Christian Liberty," by Mr. Benson, Canon of Worcester (J. W. Parker); "Education," a Sermon by Dr. Molesworth; "Discourses on Colonization and Education," by Mr. Wynter (J. W. Parker); "Abuse of Oaths," by Mr. Beames (Skeffington and Southwell); a useful tract, entitled "Congregational Independents, an Inquiry into their Faith and Practice," by Rev. H. Wray (Masters); an interesting *brochure* on "Church Colonization;" by Rev. J. Cecil Wynter (J. W. Parker); "Five Sermons, preached at Galby," &c., by Mr. Rawstorne (Hamilton and Adams), to aid in restoring the church, which was injured in a thunder-storm; a Sermon on "Papal Aggression," by Mr. Eddrup, Camden Town; "Plain Lectures on Romanism," by Rev. E. W. Relton (Wertheim); "Rome and her Claims," a well-written Sermon, by Mr. Jackson, St. James's; "Stand Fast in the Faith," by Rev. Ernest Hawkins (Rivingtons), an excellent discourse; "The Bull of Pope Pius IX., and the Ancient British Church," by Chancellor Harington (Rivingtons), written with the author's well-known research. Space forbids us to notice further at present these and other publications now before us.



## Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

UNITED STATES.—*General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church.*—At the present moment, when not only the revival of the active functions of the English Synods is becoming daily more probable, but when, moreover, the propriety of admitting the lay element into them is very generally canvassed, it will be interesting to our readers<sup>1</sup> to see a more extensive abstract of the proceedings of the triennial meeting of the American Church Convention, held at Cincinnati in the course of October last.

The opening of the Convention took place on Wednesday, October the 2nd, and its proceedings were brought to a close on Wednesday, October the 16th.

On the former day, a large number of Clergy, including twenty-three Bishops, and of lay deputies, assembled in Christ Church, Cincinnati, when, after a sermon preached by Bishop Smith, of Kentucky, on Ephesians iii. 10, the Holy Communion was administered.

The service being concluded, the Bishops retired to their own House, the proceedings of which are not regularly published, but become known only through the official result communicated to the House of Clerical and Lay-deputies, and sometimes by occasional revelations on particular questions. After the names of the deputies had been called over, and their testimonials produced, the Rev. Dr. Wyatt, of Baltimore, was unanimously elected President. After the election of a Secretary, and the transaction of other preliminary business, a resolution was passed, to the effect—

“That a committee be appointed to inform the House of Bishops that this house is now organized and ready for business.”

Another resolution was passed—

“That the clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church, students of the General Theological Seminary, candidates for orders, and members of the vestry of Christ Church, be invited to honorary seats in this convention.”

THURSDAY, THE 3RD.—The Rev. Dr. Stevens, of Pennsylvania, moved :—

“That the House of Bishops be respectfully solicited to favour the house with their opinion as to the proper posture to be observed in the baptismal service.”

This gave rise to an animated discussion.

<sup>1</sup> We hesitate the less to give precedence to this subject over every other, as there is no intelligence, either Colonial or Foreign, of great importance, excluded by the devotion of our pages to this record of the Convention of the American Church.

Against the motion it was urged that such motions were dangerous, as having a tendency to throw indirectly into the hands of one branch of the Convention the power of legislating in rubrical matters, which belonged to the whole Convention. If the meaning of the rubrics was uncertain, the legitimate mode was to alter them, as the constitution provided, by a concurrent vote of both houses. Besides, the proposed mode of settling the question would not really settle it, because the opinion of the House of Bishops was not authoritative and binding, and individuals who disagreed from it would therefore still be able to follow their own course. The same experiment had been tried with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and had failed; no uniformity of practice having been attained through the opinion of the House of Bishops pronounced in regard to it. The Bishops had no right to institute, alter, or abolish any rites or ceremonies. It was undesirable to attach so much importance to the subject; as there was a tendency to make buildings and their ornaments, attitudes and gestures, the signs of great and mysterious truths. There was great danger of the Bishops assuming too much power; the very deference which was paid to them was calculated to stimulate the lust of power which was natural to the human heart. The power of their Bishops had been increasing from the beginning. At first they were not a separate House. Then they had only a qualified veto on the proceedings of the deputies, which could be overcome by a certain vote of that house. Now they had an unqualified veto, and were a co-ordinate branch. Without contending that this was not right, it showed that there had been a progress. Want of uniformity was an evil no doubt, but they might run into other evils while seeking to avoid it. It had been so in reference to the opinion of the Bishops as to the Holy Communion. The men who did not follow it were denounced as non-conformists. Compliance or non-compliance became a party badge. And it had so far the power of law as to bring odium and denunciation upon all who did not comply with it. It was doubtful whether the Bishops themselves would like to have such an application made to them. They had been pleased that it was not done at the last Convention, and they would probably feel the same now.

In support of the motion it was said, that it contemplated no alteration of the rubric, but merely the solution of a doubt concerning a point on which the rubric was silent. In such cases it was provided that they should individually apply to the Bishop, and there was no reason why the same thing should not be done collectively. Uniformity of practice was desirable. If a man came to church in Ohio, and, as he had been accustomed, knelt in his pew, he found that all about him were standing. If he went to Virginia, and stood up, he would find all others kneeling. This was not only unpleasant but unseemly. In questions of indifference, such as this, deference to those placed in a position of superiority was the best and safest course. It was a fitter question for the Bishops to decide, than for a House partly composed of laymen. (This was urged by a layman, Judge Chambers.) There

was no danger of the Bishops ever over-riding the authority of that House. The opinion of the House of Bishops relative to the posture at the Holy Communion had not been altogether ineffectual; there had been, since 1832, a growing uniformity both as to the form of words used and as to the posture. The opinion of the Bishops continued to have increasing effect. The Bishops being the Ordinaries, it was their proper province to decide such questions, and necessarily their collective opinion would have more weight than that of individual Bishops.

Among the supporters of the motion was the Rev. Dr. Mead of Connecticut, who pleaded precedent in support of the proposition. This would not be the first action of this kind in the history of the Church. In 1832, the opinion of the House of Bishops had been asked as to the proper posture to be observed in the Communion service. It had been given, and had gone far to produce uniformity, and to relieve them from many perplexing questions. In 1835, two similar questions had arisen. One was respecting the practice of repeating the Lord's Prayer and a collect in the pulpit, before the sermon. There was no rubric for it, but such had been in some parts the practice, and there had been a diversity. The opinion of the Bishops had been asked, an answer obtained, and the practice was now uniform. In 1835, also, a lay member from Pennsylvania had introduced a motion asking the opinion of the Bishops as to the proper method of repeating the Confession and the Creed. An answer had been obtained, and uniformity on this point was now almost, if not altogether, universal. As to the point before them, what brother had not been shocked at the irreverence often exhibited in receiving a member into Christ's visible Church? Other societies, masons, odd fellows, &c., showed more reverence for their initiatory services.

Mr. Patterson, of Mississippi, was afraid the resolution would tend to the abrogation of a custom of the early Church. The custom of the early Church was to have the font at the door. When Baptism was administered there, all, of course, must stand. But, out of special reverence for the Lord's Prayer, the rubric required that they should kneel when it was said. A custom had grown up to place the font in the chancel, and now they called upon the Bishops to sanction this custom, which they had no right to do.

The Rev. Dr. Seabury, of New York, opposed the resolution on a specific ground, the peculiar situation of the diocese of New York. Its effect would be to impose a law on the Church. And it would be hard on the diocese of New York, which would in this case have *no* voice in determining the practice she would have to follow.

Eventually it was agreed to let the motion lie on the table.

FRIDAY, THE 4TH.—The Standing Committees were appointed on the third day; they are the following: On the State of the Church; On the General Theological Seminary; On the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Board; On the Admission of New Dioceses; On the Consecration of Bishops; On Canons; On Elections; On the Prayer Book; On Expenses: On Unfinished Business. Of these the first is



by far the most numerous, consisting of twenty-seven members, while the others mostly count only nine members.

The journals of the several dioceses since the last meeting of the General Convention were handed in, and referred to the Committee on the State of the Church.

A question arose, on the report of the Committee on Elections, as to the propriety of admitting to seats in the House of Deputies persons not elected directly by the Conventions of their respective dioceses, but indirectly by authority delegated from the Conventions, and by the nomination of substitutes by the Bishops in cases when the principals absented themselves. There were many conflicting opinions, and among them the subject was permitted to drop.

After some motions relative to the order of business, a resolution was adopted, on the report of the Committee on New Dioceses, for the incorporation of the newly organized diocese of Texas into the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, on its admission to representation in the General Convention.

It was notified that the House of Bishops had passed a resolution, that the alteration of article "First" of the Constitution, to wit, the substitution of the first Wednesday of September for October, as the time proposed at the last General Convention for holding the triennial meeting, be agreed to and ratified. This led to considerable discussion, which turned upon the inconvenience of members from the different states attending at certain seasons, and upon the unhealthiness of the South at the period proposed. On a vote being taken, the proposition was lost, and an intimation of the non-concurrence of the House of Deputies was ordered to be conveyed to the House of Bishops.

SATURDAY, THE 5TH.—The admission of the Diocese of Texas into union with the Convention by the House of Bishops was notified to the House. The delegates were subsequently introduced.

The General Theological Seminary became the subject of an animated discussion. An alteration was proposed by Judge Bullock, of Kentucky, in the constitution of the seminary, so as to provide that a meeting of the board of trustees shall always be held at the same time and place with the General Convention, and that special meetings of the board may be called by the presiding Bishop, at the request of a majority of the Bishops. According to the present constitution, all meetings of the board of trustees must be held in the diocese in which the seminary is situated, and, all special meetings of the board must be called by the Bishop of that diocese. It was desirable to have the seminary in reality what it was in name, a General Theological Seminary; which it was not, since the first of the provisions alluded to deprived other dioceses of their fair share of representation in the board. As to the other provision, the diocese of New York had no Bishop, and therefore, there could be no special meetings. It was desirable to have some officer empowered to call such meetings, and none could be more competent than the presiding Bishop.

Another member, Mr. Newton, of Massachusetts, proposed an amend-

ment to the 6th article of the constitution of the seminary, with a view to allow absent members of the board to vote by proxy. The whole government of the seminary was practically in the hands of the diocese of New York. The members from other dioceses present at the meetings never amounted altogether to a majority of the whole. So much was this the case, that South Carolina, which had taken more interest in, and done more for, the seminary than any other diocese, save New York, had found herself in such a dead minority, that she would no longer send her men or money to it. It would be morally impossible for trustees from distant dioceses to be present at the proposed meeting of the 2nd of November, when the election of a professor was to take place.

After a lengthened and warm discussion, it was agreed to let the further consideration of the subject stand over till the following Thursday.

A series of canons, in reference to the ordination of deacons and presbyters, the principal of which provided that candidates may be ordained deacons, without examination on any points, except fitness to discharge the duties of deacon specified in the ordinal, was referred to the Committee on Canons. The Canons were subsequently referred to the next Convention.

MONDAY, THE 7TH.—The question touching a revision of the German version of the Prayer Book was mooted by the Rev. Mr. Henderson, of New Jersey, the appointment of a joint Committee for the purpose by the last Convention having proved inoperative. He stated, that, among the 40,000 inhabitants of the city of Newark, there are 7000 or 8000 Germans; and in Cincinnati, which has 130,000 inhabitants, there are 30,000 or 40,000. The Bishop of Indiana took part in the discussion, and observed that there was no more interesting field of missionary labour than this open to the Church. The German population of the country was totally uncared for by the Protestants. The only religious influence which was exerted on them was that of Romanism, and they were fast sinking into downright infidelity. A fresh Committee was appointed to revise the German Prayer Book, and to report to the next Convention.

An important proposal was the introduction of a canon for systematizing the American canon law. Uniformity in the administration of law, the proposer argued, was a matter of great moment. It was hardly to be expected that the various Episcopal and Diocesan Courts would arrive at the same conclusions upon the various questions brought before them. An Appellate Court was, therefore, needed: and it was important to include in it that feature that had been found to work so well in the English Ecclesiastical Courts,—the introduction of laymen learned in the law. The proposition only gave jurisdiction in questions of law; it did not touch questions of fact. The canon, entitled "On Appeals," was read. Its first section provides that, in all cases decided by any diocese or court, involving questions of law, the party who considers himself aggrieved may have an appeal. He shall file a notice of it, specifying the points which he considers erroneous, and the reasons of his objections, and a declaration that he considers and believes

himself to be wronged thereby. The appeal shall be heard by the three Bishops next in seniority to the presiding Bishop and to the Bishops, if any, who may have last served in this court, and by three laymen, to be chosen, one by the applicant, one by the presiding Bishop, and one by the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese where the trial has been held. Of these, none but the layman chosen by the presiding Bishop shall belong to the diocese whose court is appealed from. The second provides for staying all proceedings until this appeal is decided; that such decision shall be final and authoritative; that it shall be certified to the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese in question, and a record be kept and deposited with the Secretary of the House of Deputies, to be accessible to every member of the Church. The third provides that a majority of this court shall be a quorum; that it shall meet within three months of the period when the appeal is entered, at the time and place fixed by the presiding Bishop. The ecclesiastical authority of the diocese where the trial took place to furnish a copy of the papers to the presiding Bishop, within one month after the appeal is taken, otherwise the decision of the Diocesan Court to be void. The fourth provides, that, in case the presiding Bishop be appealed from, the next in seniority is to perform *his* duties. The fifth, that the expenses shall be paid by the diocese appealed from. The canon was referred to the Committee on Canons.

Another and most interesting discussion arose on the subject of evidence in ecclesiastical trials; in which, in reference to a canon proposed by Mr. Duncan of Louisiana, the Committee of Canons had reported that legislation was at the present time (i. e. with reference to the still pending case of Bishop Onderdork, of New York) inexpedient. Although no practical result was arrived at, the discussion possesses great interest, both on account of the intrinsic importance of the subject, and because it throws light upon the peculiar difficulties with which it is surrounded, in consequence of the state of the law generally in the United States. Judge Chambers observed,—“Our judiciary is differently situated from that of England. With us the laws of evidence vary in different States. It is intended that the law, as existing in each State, is to be observed by the Ecclesiastical Court, according as it meets in one or another of them. But the difficulty is to know what the law is. The Bishops cannot be supposed to know. And it is, in my judgment, unnecessary that they should. There are certain great principles of justice, which when faithfully applied are abundantly sufficient.” Mr. Duncan said, these propositions had been submitted to several Bishops, and met their approbation. The question was, “whether, when the highest judiciary of the Church meets to determine questions under her general laws, it shall have rules of evidence to guide it. The dioceses have, in many cases, legislated for themselves in this matter. It is not intended to touch their provisions. The proposed canon refers only to the proceedings of the Court of Bishops. Now, is the law of evidence such, that that court can safely and wisely proceed under it? I would not allude to a case that may cause excitement, but



would refer to what lawyers call 'a case in the books,' in order to show the necessity of some alteration. When that court was last in session, its members felt and expressed the difficulty. They felt themselves governed by different rules of evidence. Is such a condition of things right? Is it just to the defendant? I think not. In such a case the defendant may be sacrificed to the conceptions of his judges. We need a canon that may guide the court, obviate this difficulty, and bring them to a conclusion, after having travelled the same course and taken the same views of law. In order to show the confusion of the law, and the injustice which may result from it, let me call the attention of the House to what one of the judges (the Bishop of Western New York) said on the occasion alluded to. 'It must be admitted,' he remarked, 'that the canon is defective—that it leaves unsettled, and even untouched, many important points. It fixes no rule as to the number of witnesses necessary to establish any point, no limitation of time within which it is lawful to bring forward charges; it even leaves it dubious whether the presenters may not be of the court, provides no right of challenge, no penalty for witnesses who refuse to attend, and we are left to grope our way in the dark.' Shall we leave them thus to grope their way amid darkness, when we have it in our power to shed light on their path? This is a favourable time when there is no case in prospect. I trust there will never be another. I hope the court may never be called together again till the resurrection morn. But it may be. And therefore it is wise that we do not leave them in the same perplexity and at liberty to legislate on the subject. Bishops have been consulted, and they prefer that action on this matter should emanate from this house. It might not be seemly for them to originate the mode by which they may be themselves hereafter brought to trial. There are several difficulties connected with the present canon. The time in which it shall be lawful to hear accusations against an individual after the criminal act has been committed is not fixed. It ought to be. I have inserted three years. The Presbyterian Church limits such time to one year. Without such a limitation a defendant may be sacrificed. An accusation may be kept until the witnesses are scattered or gone to their own final account, and then brought forward. And especially is this needed in our country. We are a moving people, and the witnesses to any transaction are scattered where it is impossible to collect them. Then, as to the rules of evidence, what could be safer than to adopt that of the State? This may involve some disadvantage, but a disadvantage far inferior to that incurred by putting a defendant on trial under rules of evidence different from the only ones which he can be supposed to know, those adopted in the State where he resides. Nor can there be any real difficulty arising from the diversity of those laws. The Supreme Court of the United States is in such a category. It gives, and rightly gives, sometimes on the same day, directly opposite opinions under the precisely same state of law and fact. And why? Because they arise in different States where different laws of evidence prevail. And they do right; because all

men are supposed to know the law which is in force in the State where they reside. The Court must, where the alleged crime has been committed, ascertain both the law and the facts. In this is there any safer guide than the law of the land? I think not; but, if that should not be the general opinion it will be easy to fix upon some other rule." Mr. Duncan concluded by reading his canon, entitled a "Canon Supplementary to Canon 3 of 1844, of the Trial of Bishops," and which provides,—

"1. That no alleged offence of longer date than three years' standing shall be a subject for trial.

"2. That the rules of evidence shall be observed by the court, which are observed by the civil tribunals of the State in which the trial is held.

"3. That the name of any known person in the city where the trial is held, or within twenty miles of it, who, being summoned as a witness, shall refuse to appear, shall be reported by the Court to the Rector of the parish to which he or she belongs, and, if the person be a communicant of the Church, the Rector shall proceed at once to strike his or her name from the list of communicants."

After some further discussion the canon was laid on the table.

Another question connected with the case of Bishop Onderdonk was brought on by Judge Chambers, who moved that it be referred to the Committee on Canons to inquire into the expediency of so amending Canon 2 of 1847, as to require that the call of a special meeting of the House of Bishops therein provided for shall be made within a *reasonable time* after the application by five Bishops to the Presiding Bishop. In the year 1847, he remarked, the General Convention passed the canon referred to, for the purpose of admitting a modification by the House of Bishops of a sentence of suspension. It provided for a call of the House for this purpose, by the Presiding Bishop acting at the suggestion of five other Bishops, and that the time shall be fixed at a period not less than three months after the request shall be made. A well-known principle of law ought to have put a limit on the other side. That principle was, that when a thing is commanded it must be done in a reasonable time. This, Judge Chambers complained, had not been done in the case of the requisition addressed by Five Bishops to the Presiding Bishop, for the reconsideration of the case of Bishop Onderdonk of New York. The Presiding Bishop had delayed the matter for eight, some said for twelve months, till the meeting of the General Convention, and thereby defeated the object of the requisition.

After a lengthy and occasionally warm discussion, the motion to lay on the table was put and lost.

TUESDAY, THE 8TH. Judge Bullock presented a Memorial addressed to the General Convention by clergymen and laymen of the diocese of Maryland. The memorialists understand the Bishop of the diocese of Maryland to claim the right,—

"1. Of administering the Lord's Supper by virtue of his office, and without the invitation of the rector, in every parish and congregation of

his diocese, on occasions of canonical visitation, or at any other time, when, with due regard to circumstances, he may express the desire to do so.

"2. The right of appropriating the offerings of the people collected on such occasions.

"3. The right, when he may be present at public worship in any church of his diocese, to pronounce the declaration of absolution in the morning and evening prayer."

The memorialists then go on to discuss the "nature and extent of the claims of the episcopal authority asserted and maintained in the diocese of Maryland; the reasons for believing them unfounded; and the necessity of legislation upon the subject."

The memorial gave rise to a long and most animated discussion between those who take a high, and those who take a low view of episcopal prerogative; which, however, is of slight interest, as it turned not so much upon the intrinsic merits of the point at issue, as upon the question whether the matter should be left to be dealt with in the ordinary way by the Committee on Canons, or referred to a special Committee. The House being unable to come to a conclusion, the question was adjourned to Thursday.

WEDNESDAY, THE 9TH.—The Committee on Canons reported a canon on clergymen who declare they will no longer be ministers of the Church, providing for a delay of three months in all cases, and an additional delay of three months at the discretion of the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese, between the receiving such a declaration from a minister and the pronouncing of his displacement. During this time it shall be lawful for the minister to reconsider and withdraw his declaration.

The Rev. Dr. Mason proposed an amendment to Canon 3 of 1844, on the trial of bishops. It provides that the court shall consist of the bishops of the five nearest dioceses, provided none of them be of the number of the presenting bishops, and gives the accused bishop the right of challenge for cause against any of the judges. The proposed amendment, together with the canon on the same subject, referred by the last General Convention to this, and the canon on the same subject, proposed by Mr. Duncan, were referred to the Committee on Canons.

On a message from the House of Bishops, a joint committee was appointed, on the report of the missionary bishops.

A resolution that, the House of Bishops concurring, a joint committee be appointed to prepare a table of the degrees of consanguinity and affinity within which it shall not be lawful to marry, and publish the same in the standard Bible, was laid on the table after a few remarks on the excitement which this question had caused in the Church of England, and among the Presbyterians.

The consideration of the Maryland memorial having been resumed, it was resolved, in the event of the House of Bishops concurring, to refer it, and the report of the Committee on Canons, relative to the existing canons bearing on the point, to a joint committee of both



Houses, including seven members of the House of Deputies: A difficulty then arose as to the selection of the Committee; the chairman declining the task, two members (one from each party) were appointed to nominate the seven members of the committee. They agreed on six, and being unable to agree on the seventh, proposed two names, of which the House selected one by ballot.

The consideration of the General Theological Society was resumed: The committee reported that it was inexpedient to hold the triennial meeting of the Board of Trustees at the same time and place as the General Convention, and recommended two Canons, to the following effect:—"1. The board of trustees concurring, that hereafter special meetings of the Board may be called by a majority of the bishops, they designating who of their number shall act in calling it.

"2. That absent members of the board of trustees may vote, in the election of professors, by proxy given to a co-trustee."

These two resolutions having been adopted, Mr. Newton, of Massachusetts, moved, that in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the triennial meeting of the board of trustees shall be held at the time and place of that of the General Convention, and that the report be recommitted to the committee, with instructions to report to that effect. The seminary was now under the control of the diocese of New York, and it would never be otherwise, unless there could be some such occasion of a general meeting of the board. This was important, both to the Church and the seminary. It had enormous property, understood to be worth about 350,000 dollars, to which had been added recently 100,000 dollars more; and was doing, in proportion to its means, but little good. One reason was, that it had been under a partial and local influence.

Mr. Dobbin, of Maryland, a member of the committee, observed, that the seminary, as a literary institution, differed from all other Church institutions. As such it had buildings, libraries, professors,—in short a local habitation. Hence it seemed essential that its government should be carried on upon the ground where it is placed. The Convention was migratory. The trustees amounted to more than 200 in number—the members of this convention between 200 and 300. There would be a great inconvenience in bringing some 500 gentlemen a long distance from home, not for the transaction of business, but for review, terminating most usually in a mere formal report.

The Rev. Mr. Mead, of Connecticut.—Of the 200 members of the board, 135 lived within one easy day's journey of the city of New York. He would ask if there were any inconvenience where the large number were thus within a day's journey of the place of meeting, so as to demand that the whole body shall be dragged to any place, however distant, where the General Convention may meet? The great evil under which the seminary had laboured was, that it had been for some years an institution without a head, which had arisen from the fact that it had had a non-resident bishop at its head. There were great difficulties growing out of this, as to the police regulations of the institution. The trustees

had laboured hard to correct this, and had once passed a code which they thought would do so. It was within a year of the meeting of the General Convention in New York. The triennial meeting of the board was held. They reviewed the proceedings and swept the whole away, disheartening those who had laboured, and leaving the whole work to be done over again. Ought this to occur? But, adopt this alteration, and the evil would be tenfold. It had been said that the seminary, with its large property, had done comparatively little good. Its property might be large, but it was unproductive. It was in real estate, which, however it might be estimated, did not yield a large revenue. It had increased and was increasing in value. But the trustees would not sell or encumber it. But it had done good. It had improved its real estate and erected two buildings sufficient for the accommodation of 140 students and the professors. See too what they had done in the way of theological education. More than twenty members of this House, and four of the right reverend members of the other House were among the alumni.

Mr. Williams, of Virginia, observed that at the last triennial meeting of the board there were only fifty-six members present. Of these thirty were from New York. And yet special efforts had been made to get a full attendance. Now, if this was a general seminary, let some plan be adopted by which it shall be no longer virtually a diocesan institution. He felt constrained to state that the confidence of the Church in the institution seemed impaired. This was evident from the diminished contributions. The question was, whether the interests of the Church would be best promoted by holding the meetings of the board where only a few could attend, or at the meeting of the General Convention, where more could be present.

Dr. Mead, in reply, accounted for the diminution of the contributions on the ground of the erroneous impression prevalent that the seminary was rich, and did not need money.

Judge Conygham was on the joint committee of the convention of 1844. There was then a general feeling that something ought to be done to secure to the more distant dioceses their proper influence. At that time the committee had thought and reported that the adoption of the proxy system would be all that was necessary. The case was plain. If the dioceses were to be represented in the board, their trustees ought to have a voice. But the difficulties in the way of their attendance were so great as to make it almost impossible. It was important to remove this difficulty. The proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts did this. Of the 134 trustees who could conveniently attend the meetings of the board now, seventy belonged to the state of New York. This demonstrated how completely the seminary had become the property of New York. And, as all alterations of the constitution were to be the joint act of the trustees and the convention, it would be well to bring them near together.

The Rev. Mr. Patterson, of Mississippi, wanted to see justice done the Seminary. The Theological Seminary was born, endowed, built up in

the diocese of New York, and then offered as a boon to the Church. This was the relation of the Church and the diocese to that institution. It was given on conditions, which the Church would violate if they passed this resolution. The reason why there were so many trustees in the diocese of New York was, that the Church had heretofore complied with those conditions. The non-attendance of the trustees who resided near New York was quoted as proving that the Seminary was regarded with suspicion. But there was another reason. They saw the good which it was doing. And they knew that this must be the result of good management. Who were those who spoke of suspicion? Had they ever given any thing to its funds? Not a dime. Were they the men who ought to speak? It was well to let well alone. The seminary had done well and needed no legislation, especially from those who were interested in rival institutions. Ought they to come and seek to break the compact under which this seminary had been established?

The Rev. Mr. Trapier rose to correct a mistake of the last speaker as to the history of the seminary, but was interrupted by a message from the House of Bishops, informing this House that they have concurred in referring the Maryland memorial and its accompanying documents to a joint committee, and had appointed on their part on said committee Bishops Brownell, Hopkins, Ives, McIlvaine, and Polk.

THURSDAY, THE 10th.—A message from the House of Bishops announced their concurrence in a resolution previously passed by the House of Deputies, designating New York as the place for the next meeting of the General Convention.

The Committee on Canons reported a canon "on Assistant Bishops," providing that, in case of any permanent cause of disability in a Bishop of a Diocese, an Assistant Bishop may be elected. In case the disability arise from a suspension of the Bishop, he shall not direct the services of the Assistant. But a suspended Bishop shall have power to give his assent to the election of an Assistant. The canon was ordered to be printed.

The adjourned debate on the General Theological Seminary having been resumed, the Rev. Mr. Trapier, of South Carolina, said the seminary was not, as had been alleged, a boon from the diocese of New York to the Church, but rather the reverse. It had existed in Connecticut as a general seminary before it was transferred to New York. That it had previously existed in New York, he would not deny. But this had nothing to do with the point in hand. In 1812 the subject of a General Theological Seminary had occurred to the mind of Bishop Dehon, of South Carolina. He spoke to several individuals, among whom was Bishop Hobart, then Assistant Bishop of New York. The prelate's view was, that it was desirable to have one; and his first proposal was, that it should be located in the diocese of New Jersey (where he had a country-seat which he was fond of visiting), and to be under the presidency of the Bishop of New York, and the vice-presidency of the Bishop of New Jersey. It was not, however, a general, but a diocesan seminary which he desired.



The Rev. Dr. Jarvis.—The time of the conversation was 1812. The proposal for a general seminary was brought forward at the general Convention of 1814, in the House of Bishops, by Bishop Dehon, and in the House of Delegates by Dr., now Bishop Gadsden. At that time the Bishop and Delegates of New York opposed it. In 1817 it was again brought up in the House of Bishops, and was favourably received.

The Rev. Mr. Trapier.—Bishop Hobart's views, then, were for a diocesan seminary; Bishop Dehon was for a general one. Bishop Hobart consented finally to this, on condition that it should be located in New York. To this Bishop Dehon agreed, in order to secure his co-operation, and the General Convention, in 1817, adopted the provision. The whole object of the proceeding, however, was to harmonize the Church in the establishment and support of the institution. The efforts to establish it were not at first successful. Such was the report of the Committee to the Convention of 1820. That body recommended its transfer to New Haven, where it did next exist for a short time; but, before the next General Convention, Mr. Sherred died, and it was ascertained that a considerable sum, say 60,000 dollars, might be secured by removing the seminary to New York. To consider this, the special Convention of 1821 was called, and they changed once more its location to New York.

The Rev. Dr. Van Ingen.—The will did not make the condition that the General Seminary should be removed to New York.

The Rev. Mr. Trapier.—The will was in substance this. Certain moneys were to be invested in stocks at compound interest, until such time as a general or diocesan Theological Seminary should be established within the diocese of New York, and then they should go to the trustees of the said seminary. There was, at the time, a diocesan seminary in New York, and a legal question arose, whether the general seminary, being first mentioned, or the diocesan, being already on the ground, had the first claim. An agreement was, however, arrived at which rendered a legal decision unnecessary. The General Seminary was transferred to New York. And a constitution was adopted which gave, as some thought, quite sufficient control to the diocese of New York. For not only was the institution located there, but the trustees met there, its Bishop called all special meetings, and no professor could be removed except at such special meeting. Such was the history, from which it was manifest that the seminary was not established in and by New York, and given as a boon to the Church, but, having been established, was finally located there to secure co-operation. There were some dioceses that had not as yet a pecuniary interest in it, but they had an equal spiritual interest in it, and it was their duty to do what they could to guide it aright. The South was not opposed to its interests. South Carolina was among its warmest friends until recently. This interest had been for several years declining. Their candidates for orders were, with only an occasional exception, sent elsewhere. Their trustees had ceased to attend the meetings. This change was not limited to South Carolina. In the Augustan age of that institution there were ninety

students. Last year there were only forty-eight. Their clergy, meanwhile, had doubled in numbers; their candidates for orders increased. The difficulty arising from the present arrangements, which prevented the attendance of trustees from a distance, was one of the causes of the subsiding interest in the institution. At the last meeting thirty-one trustees present were from the diocese of New York, and only nineteen from elsewhere. This was on no less an occasion than the nomination of trustees. As to South Carolina, she had found herself in such a dead minority that her trustees had ceased to go, and their election was regarded as almost a mere form. He was glad of the concession of the proxy system as far as it had gone. But it did not satisfy him. It did not extend, for example, to the nomination of professors, but only to the election. But none could be elected who had not at a previous meeting been nominated. The proposed resolution was the only adequate remedy. As to what had been said about the injury arising from frequent changes in the government of the seminary, he would say, that either this seminary as a *general* one was impracticable, or these disadvantages must be risked. If the seminary continued as it was, *not*, in fact, a *general* one, the result would be, that, as the Church extended, the interest in it would diminish. If they wished well to this institution, they should adopt some such measure as this. The inconveniences connected with this were better than the greater evils which must exist while things remained as they were. Either let the seminary be in fact what it was in name, or make it in name what it was in fact.

The Rev. Mr. Corbyn, of Mobile, thought that the attendance of a greater number of trustees at a triennial meeting could not be secured by this resolution. Of this board, 156 members resided on the Atlantic coast, and could easily reach New York. But suppose the General Convention were to meet in St. Louis, only sixty-four of that number could come as delegates. The remaining ninety-two must come at an aggregate expense of some 9000 dollars. Was it in accordance with common sense to require this? Again. It would be the death-blow of this institution to have its affairs controlled by a deliberative body. It was the evil under which so many of their literary institutions suffered, to be controlled by legislative bodies who knew nothing of their wants. The number of students was not the question. The seminary might be doing a noble work, if it had only nine instead of ninety students. If it kept up the standard of theological learning, it was doing such a work. And the effect of their interfering with it would be to lay that standard in the dust.

The Rev. Mr. Patterson, of Mississippi, repeated that the seminary was a boon to the Church, and that it was established under a compact, which this resolution would violate. Out of 237,000 dollars the diocese of New York had given all but 58,000 dollars, and had a right to control it. New York had the means to erect a seminary, and she did so, and made it a general seminary, on the condition that she should control it. And no convention could violate this condition without radicalism.

The distant trustees, having institutions of their own, and their interests being naturally engaged for these, did not care for the General Seminary. And ought the majority of the board to be moved about from place to place to meet men who had no interest in the concerns of the institution under their care? In every period when the religious spirit was aroused, there was a tendency to extremes. It was so now. Some were disposed to think well of Rome and her errors,—some went so far into radicalism as to call the illegitimate brood of dissent sister Churches. Neither were men to legislate on the affairs of the Church. They did not represent the mass, who were as much unaffected by these extravagances as the depths of the ocean by the storms which vex the surface. If such men were permitted to meet in the board of trustees, would they be any wiser or less wedded to their peculiar opinions? And was the board to degrade itself, by permitting these strifes to be carried on in the midst of it?

Mr. Dobbin, of Maryland, agreed that the interest of the trustees of all the dioceses should be operative. He thought this secured by the action already had. There were two classes of duties belonging to this institution, teaching and police. The first was by far the most important to the Church, and over this the provision of voting by proxy in the election of professors gave all the trustees their due control. As to the other, interference and change was to be deprecated. Stability was essential, and if it could not be secured they had better give the institution up.

Mr. Williams, of Virginia, thought the distrust in the seminary arose from the fact that it was thought to be under the control of the diocese of New York. But he rose chiefly to remonstrate against what the gentleman had said of the radicalism of those who called the illegitimate brood of dissent sister Churches. If the gentleman had learnt this of his Alma Mater, it might help to account for the general distrust. But when they looked around, and saw God blessing the labours of other Christian bodies, he asked himself, "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?" When he found their Church in the preface to her book of Common Prayer, calling them Churches, why should he not do so with perfect consistency? He thought of our Saviour, when told that the disciples had forbid one to cast out devils because he followed not after them, and when He said, "forbid them not." He entered his solemn protest against such language.

After some further discussion, the resolution of amendment requiring that a meeting of the trustees shall be held at the time and place of the General Convention was carried. The vote was taken by dioceses and by orders, with the following result; twenty-nine dioceses were represented by the clergy, of which seventeen voted in the affirmative and ten in the negative, and two were divided; twenty-four dioceses were represented by the laity, of which fifteen were in the affirmative, seven in the negative, and two divided.

FRIDAY, THE 11TH.—The Committee on Canons reported that a section be added to Canon 4 of 1844, providing that, in case a



suspended Bishop desire to resign, at any period not within six calendar months before the meeting of any General Convention, he shall make known such desire to the Presiding Bishop, who shall communicate the same to every Bishop in this Church having jurisdiction, and, in case a majority of said Bishops return to the Presiding Bishop their written assent to such resignation, the same shall be valid and final, and the Presiding Bishop shall make known such resignation to the Bishop and diocese concerned, and to each Bishop of this Church.

The Report of the Joint Committee on the Maryland memorial was presented. It recommended the adoption of the canon reported by the Committee on Canons of the House of Deputies, on Episcopal Visitations, somewhat amended, as follows :

“ON EPISCOPAL VISITATIONS.

“Sec. 1. Every Bishop in this Church shall visit the churches within his Diocese, for the purpose of examining the state of his Church, inspecting the behaviour of his Clergy, ministering the Word, and, if he see fit, the Lord’s Supper, to the people committed to his charge, and administering the Apostolic Rite of Confirmation. And it is deemed proper that such visitation be made once in three years, at least, by every Bishop to every Church within his Diocese, which shall make provision for defraying the necessary expenses of the Bishop at such visitations. And it is hereby declared to be the duty of the Minister and Vestry of every Church, or Congregation, to make such provision accordingly.

“Sec. 2. But it is to be understood that, to enable the Bishop to make the aforesaid visitation, it shall be the duty of the Clergy, in such reasonable rotation as may be devised, to officiate for him in any parochial duties which may belong to him.

“Sec. 3. It shall be the duty of the Bishop to keep a Register of his proceedings at every visitation of his Diocese.

“Sec. 4. Canon 21 of 1832 is hereby repealed.”

The report further stated, that, as no question occasioning difference of opinion remained unadjusted by the canon, they advise, that the canon reported as an amendment to Canon 26 of 1832 be withdrawn. The report was signed by Bishops Brownell, Hopkins, Ives, and Polk, Rev. Dr. Van Ingen, Rev. Mr. Tomes, and Messrs. Chambers and Wharton.

The minority of the committee presented a counter report, recommending the following resolutions :—

“1st. That it is inexpedient at present to legislate upon the subject of the Canon proposed by the Committee on Canons.

“2nd. That the committee be discharged from further consideration of the subject.”

This was signed by Bishop M’Ilvaine, Rev. Drs. Stevens and Neville, and Mr. Taylor.

The whole subject was laid on the table, and made a special order for Saturday.

The canon on the journal of the last General Convention, giving to a suspended Bishop the power to resign was taken up, as reported by the Committee on Canons, and on the motion of the Rev. Dr. Mead, adopted. At the suggestion of the delegation from New York, the delegation of any diocese were empowered to have their dissent on this canon entered upon the minutes. The clerical delegation from New York, and the lay delegation from New Jersey, availed themselves of this privilege.

The canon on the last journal, on the certificates of bishops elect, requiring a majority of two-thirds of a diocese to elect a bishop, was indefinitely postponed.

A canon reported by the Committee on Canons, of candidates for orders who have been ministers or licentiates of other religious denominations, was then taken up for consideration. The canon requires such persons to remain candidates at least a year instead of six months as heretofore. The Rev. Dr. Van Ingen moved its adoption. The Rev. Dr. Atkinson opposed it. He thought it well to leave the discretion of the bishops untouched. Judge Chambers showed that the canon relates exclusively to candidates who had been ministers of other denominations, who were now admitted at half the time in which it was possible for those who had been bred in the Church to obtain orders. The question was, should this continue? The Rev. Mr. M'Coy said: "I am situated amid a population of some 40,000 souls, where I am the only minister of the Church. Within the sphere of my knowledge there are several who are, and have been for two or three years past, investigating the claims of our Church. They have studied its peculiarities, and, by the aid of all the helps they can get, are inquiring as to its conformity with Scripture. Now, after a man has spent years in this study, as I did, and is about sundering many ties dear to his heart, and when all the difficulties connected with that severance press upon him, will you compel him to provide for his family for this additional time? Will you throw this increased difficulty in his way? I think such a course impracticable and injurious. I hope that the discretion heretofore confided in the bishop will be continued. We need a supply of ministers who, in the spirit of our Master, will do the Church's work. There is nothing I desire so much as to have ten such men near me to help me in the work which the Church has assigned me. And, if God is opening the eyes of men in other religious bodies to see the excellence of our Church, I hope we will allow them to come and help us." The canon was lost.

Another canon was reported by the Committee on Canons, of ministers removing from one diocese to another, in substitution of Canon 5 of 1844. This provides by an additional section that every minister removing from one diocese to another shall apply for letters dimissory. If he does not do so within three months, the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese which he has left may send them to the authority of the diocese to which he has removed; and, if this latter refuse to receive him, he must return to the former diocese.

The Rev. Dr. Van Ingen said this new section was to enable the ecclesiastical authority of a diocese to reach clergymen who now by absenting themselves from their canonical home, and residing in distant dioceses, escaped discipline. Rev. Dr. Vinton.—This canon is not confined to such cases. It covers the whole subject of removals. It touches an original principle. It recognizes the right of a bishop to refuse to receive a clergyman who comes to him with letters dimissory, and to send him back to the diocese whence he came. This had never before been conceded to a bishop. Rev. Dr. Jarvis.—It is implied in the canon already existing. Rev. Dr. Vinton.—I want to see the statute which confers it. The Church has no where sanctioned the principle, and will we now introduce it in a covert way? He thought the Church and the Convention were not prepared to assent to it. The Rev. Dr. Jarvis explained a principle of canon law which applied to this matter. A bishop may not ordain a presbyter without a title, that is, without the assurance that some parish will support him. If he does, he is bound to support him. Now he may ordain a man who is inefficient, and a burden on his hands. He may therefore be willing to send him away to trouble some other bishop. This canon is to enable him to protect himself, and it is a just and equitable provision. The discussion was further continued in favour of the canon, upon the ground of the necessity of some such action to meet the cases, such as occurred and might occur, in which clergymen, leaving their own dioceses without taking letters dimissory, and going to reside in distant parts of the country, were practically emancipated from discipline. And on the ground that the separate dioceses, which were distinct and perfect Churches, had not, in coming into the union of this Church, parted with the inherent right which belonged to every bishop to decide whether or not he would admit any minister among the number of his clergy.

It was urged in opposition to it, that it embodied a new principle which was contrary to their past and present legislation, by which they held a bishop bound to receive every minister coming with clean papers, and that it interfered with the rights of the laity to elect and have their own ministers. It was contended that the true remedy for the evils alleged was to provide by law for the trial of clergymen in the place where the crime was committed, and any method of determining what are the rights of a bishop from any source but the laws and canons of the Church was protested against. The discussion was adjourned.

A message was received from the House of Bishops, informing the House that they concurred in passing the canon of episcopal resignations.

The House then took up the order of the day, viz. the canon of Assistant Bishops, reported by the Committee on Canons, which is as follows :—

“ OF ASSISTANT BISHOPS.

“ SECT. 1. When the Bishop of any Diocese is unable, by reason of



any permanent cause, to discharge his episcopal duties, an Assistant Bishop may, with his consent, be elected by, and for such Diocese, who shall in all cases succeed the Bishop, in case of surviving him. The Assistant Bishop shall perform such Episcopal duties, and exercise such Episcopal authority in the Diocese, as the Bishop shall assign to him; and in case of the Bishop's inability to assign such duties, arising from the suspension of his jurisdiction, or declared by the Convention of the Diocese, the Assistant Bishop shall, during such inability, perform all the duties, and exercise all the authorities which appertain to the office of Bishop. No person shall be elected or consecrated a Suffragan Bishop, nor shall there be more than one Assistant Bishop at the same time.

“Sect. 2. If the Bishop of the Diocese shall be under sentence of suspension at the time at which it is proposed to elect an Assistant Bishop, he shall, notwithstanding such suspension, be competent to give his assent to the election of an Assistant Bishop.

“Sect. 3. Canon 6 of 1832 is hereby repealed.”

Mr. Yerger, of Mississippi, proposed a substitute, providing that a sentence of suspension which has been, or may hereafter be, inflicted on a Bishop, shall be among the reasons for appointing an Assistant Bishop,—that where a Bishop is suspended, or shall be declared by his Convention incapable, the services of the Assistant shall not be under his direction, and in such case his assent shall not be necessary to the election. He referred to the case of the Diocese of New York, and her application for relief. He thought the Committee's canon would not give her the relief she required, because it did not specify suspension as a reason for electing an Assistant Bishop. But more than this, because it made the consent of the Bishop necessary even when he had been suspended. This principle he maintained to be contrary to the established law of the Church for twenty years back. And he thought that, although the proposed principle was sustained by the practice of the primitive Church, they were bound in a case like this, which involved nothing higher than human regulations, to follow the laws of their own Church. He thought, too, that it would be difficult, and in some cases impossible, to obtain the consent of a Bishop. He concluded by a touching appeal to the friends of the Bishop of New York, to acquiesce in some such arrangement as this.

Eventually the subject was recommitted to the Committee on Canons, with instructions to report a canon authorizing a diocese having a suspended bishop to elect an assistant bishop.

SATURDAY, THE 12TH.—The Committee on Canons reported a canon of the trial of Bishops, the same as that on the journal of the last Convention, with a few verbal alterations. They also reported, in pursuance with the instructions of the house, the following Canon of the election of an assistant Bishop by a diocese whose Bishop is indefinitely suspended. A diocese deprived of the services of its Bishop by a sentence of suspension heretofore pronounced, and not limited to a precise time, may proceed to the election of an assistant Bishop,

who, when duly consecrated, shall exercise all the powers and authority of the Bishop of the diocese during the suspension of the Bishop, and who, in case of the remission of the sentence of the Bishop, and his restoration to the exercise of his jurisdiction, shall perform the duties prescribed by Canon 6 of 1832, and who in all cases shall succeed to the Bishop, on his death or resignation. The Rev. Dr. Higbee, in behalf of the delegation from New York, called for the vote by dioceses and orders. The vote was then taken, and resulted as follows:—Of the clergy twenty-seven dioceses voted aye, and one (that of New York) in the negative. So the canon was adopted.

An amendment to the canon on appeals before offered, providing that, in all questions of doctrine, a majority of the Bishops on the Appellate Court shall be necessary to a decision, was referred to the Committee on Canons.

On the order of the day on the reports of the majority and minority of the Joint Committee on the Maryland memorial, the Rev. Dr. Vinton moved that the report be recommitted, with instructions to report that it is inexpedient to legislate at this time, except in the way of appointing an appellate tribunal.

Judge Chambers thought they were bound, by every consideration, to act on the canon. Three years ago a proposition had been introduced, having reference to this subject, which was referred to the Committee on Canons, who reported it as a matter proper for the action of this Convention, to which it was referred. In consequence of this delay, the subject became again a matter of discussion in Maryland. And now they were asked to set aside the proposed action altogether, for the reason that it may at some future day be determined by some other body, or some judicial tribunal to be hereafter established. The question of the propriety of such a court was one which should be considered by itself, when the Church was absolutely unruffled by the slightest breath of any exciting or personal question. This Convention was not now prepared to act on it.

The Rev. Dr. Vinton said, by adopting the idea of an appellate court, they should not be legislating for a special case, but on the broad basis of general principles. They might with propriety defer the present proposed action, since the attention of both Houses was turned to the other question.

Mr. Newton of Massachusetts observed, that it was stated in the report of the minority, "that it is not expedient to invest the Bishops of this Church with the right of administering the Lord's Supper upon occasions of canonical visitation." That had been placed on the record. And, if they postponed the consideration of this subject, they would affirm that proposition. And were they who believed in the apostolic authority of the office of a Bishop going to affirm such a proposition as this? It would be a disgrace to the Church to do so.

Mr. Pendleton, of Ohio, did not think that the postponement would affirm that proposition, but rather the contrary. It merely amounted to a declaration that it was inexpedient at this time for the Convention to

act upon the subject. And he thought it was so. They could not legislate upon it without altering the rubrics. And he protested against that. He could not imagine any contingency that could exist to induce him to lay hands on the Prayer Book. The Constitution had thrown its safeguards around it. And with extreme solicitude it guarded the approach to any change in it. He would not discuss the question whether there be a conflict between this proposed canon and the rubric. But they would see the fitness of that article of the Constitution which regulates the whole matter of altering the Prayer Book. It was the arms of the Church thrown around that depository of her conservatism. This was the first case where such a collision had sprung up. And he could not agree that they were to meet it by altering the order of the Constitution.

After a lengthened discussion, the vote upon the motion indefinitely to postpone the whole subject of the Maryland memorial was taken by orders and dioceses, and the question decided in the negative.

MONDAY, THE 14TH.—A report of the Committee on Canons recommended the postponement, until the next General Convention, of the proposed amendment of the Constitution, requiring delegates to be communicants; of the canon of ministers officiating within the parochial cures of other clergymen; and of the canon of appeals.

The report also recommended the adoption of the canon transmitted by the House of Bishops, making it the duty of the presiding Bishop to call a meeting of the House of Bishops within a period, not less than three, nor more than six, months from the time of his being requested so to do.

The Committee having reported that it is inexpedient to amend the Constitution, by striking out that clause of article 5th (the third), which requires 8000 square miles and thirty presbyters in each division of any existing diocese, before such division can be made, a discussion ensued, and eventually the subject was referred back to the Committee on Canons, with instructions to report a resolution recommending such an alteration of the Constitution.

Two messages were received from the House of Bishops.

The first informed the House that they had passed a canon, "of clergymen canonically resident in one diocese, chargeable with misdemeanors in another." The first section provides that, if a clergyman canonically resident in one diocese be chargeable with misdemeanor in another, the ecclesiastical authority of the latter shall inform that of the former. If this diocese do not act upon the information in three months, then the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese where the offence was committed may have him tried, as if under its jurisdiction. The second section provides, that if a clergyman who has come temporarily into a diocese, and not with intention to reside, be chargeable with any crime or misdemeanor, the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese, if satisfied thereof, may prohibit his ministering within its bounds; of which prohibition due notice shall be given to the ecclesiastical authority of the diocese to which he belongs, and to the minister of every parish of the diocese in which the prohibition has



been made. And this prohibition shall continue until the ecclesiastical authority which has inflicted it remove it. This was referred to the Committee on Canons.

The other message informed the House that the House of Bishops had resolved, this House concurring, that the Convention should adjourn *sine die*, on Wednesday, Oct. 16, which was agreed to.

The debate on the Maryland memorial was again resumed, and continued till the adjournment of the House.

During the discussion several messages were received from the House of Bishops:—

1. Transmitting a canon just passed by them on the removal of Ministers from one diocese to another.

2. Informing the House that they had amended and passed the canon of the election of assistant Bishops, passed by the House. The amendment consisted in striking out the word "*assistant*" in the title and body of the canon wherever it occurs, save in the last instance.

3. Informing the House that they concurred in the proposed alterations of the constitution of the General Theological Seminary, with the amendment, that, when a *vacancy* existed in the diocese of New York, the Bishops might call special meetings.

TUESDAY, THE 15TH.—The greater part of the day was again consumed by the debate on the Maryland memorial, and terminated in a vote giving the Bishop the right to administer the Communion during his visitation, which was carried by a large majority of both orders.

The House also determined to employ the New York Bible and Prayer Book Society to publish a standard edition of the Bible.

WEDNESDAY, THE 16TH.—The House was informed that Bishop Southgate's resignation of the mission to Constantinople had been accepted by the House of Bishops.

The canon on *Foreign Missionary Bishops* was, with the concurrence of the House of Bishops, amended, making them eligible to Diocesan Bishoprics by permission of *three-fourths* of the House of Bishops, and *three-fourths* of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies or Standing Committee.

The canon relative to the election of a Provisional Bishop in a diocese whose Bishop is indefinitely suspended, as amended by the House of Bishops, passed by the following vote—Clergy, ayes, 26; noes 1. (New York.)—Laity, ayes, 20; noes 1. (New Jersey.)

The remaining business being disposed of, and the Bishops having entered the House, the whole Convention united in prayer, and adjourned.

The following proceedings are stated to have taken place in the House of Bishops, of whose deliberations there are no regular reports published. On the question touching the Maryland memorial, the Bishop of Virginia offered a resolution, "that it is inexpedient to take any legislative action on the subject referred to in these memorials," which obtained only three or four supporters, and was accordingly

rejected. The Bishop of Pennsylvania then moved, "that further action on the subject, by the House, at this time, is not advisable." This was supported by twelve votes,—those of the Bishops of Illinois, Connecticut, Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Louisiana, Georgia, Delaware, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Maine, and the Assistant Bishop of Virginia. The matter finally terminated by the adoption of the canon "on Episcopal Visitations" before reported, which passed by a vote of 17 to 10.

The Bishop of Western New York presented a series of resolutions, with a view to the institution of Provinces and Provincial Conventions, intermediate between the General and Diocesan Conventions.

On the motion of the Bishop of Pennsylvania, and with no dissenting voice but that of the Bishop of Kentucky, a committee was appointed to report, in 1853, whether some plan cannot be devised by which, consistently with the principles of our reformed faith, the services of intelligent and pious persons of both sexes may be secured in the education of the young, the relief of the sick and destitute, the care of orphans and friendless immigrants, and the reformation of the vicious. The committee is composed of the Bishops of Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New Hampshire, and Pennsylvania.

The Rev. John Payne was elected missionary Bishop for Western Africa.

The House of Bishops have refused to remit the sentence of Bishop B. T. Onderdonk, of New York, and have rejected the petition of the diocese by a majority of about 2 to 1. They have also refused to restore Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, by a vote of 17 to 9.

At the close of its Report the *New York Churchman* observes:—"We are happy to learn from various independent sources that the meeting was conducted with great dignity, suavity, and harmony on the whole, considering the great diversity of views existing among the members, and that the impressions produced upon those who witnessed it cannot but be favourable."

*Special Convention of the Diocese of New York.*—As soon as the decision of the General Convention had been duly notified to the Standing Committee of the diocese of New York, a notice was issued by that body, convening a Special Convention for Wednesday, the 27th of November, "To take into consideration the Canon passed in the late General Convention, entitled, 'Of the election of a Provisional Bishop in the case of a diocese whose Bishop is suspended, without a precise limitation of time;' and to proceed to the election of a Provisional Bishop under the said Canon, should the Convention so determine."

On the Convention being assembled accordingly, a motion was proposed by the Hon. J. C. Spencer, to the effect: "That, as doubts were entertained of the power of the Standing Committee to call a Special Convention, this Convention will not proceed to any business."

On the question being put, the votes stood: Clergy, ayes, 17; noes, 94. Laity, ayes, 18; noes, 109.

The motion was therefore lost, and the election made the order of the

day for the following day. On Thursday, after morning prayers, the business of the election was proceeded with. Seven ballots were had in succession, on Thursday and Friday, but without effect. In the first ballot Dr. Seabury had a majority both of Clerical and Lay votes, the names next to his being those of Dr. Whitehouse and Dr. Williams; but, Dr. Seabury's votes not amounting to a clear majority (above one-half of all the votes) of either order, there was no election. On the second ballot, Dr. Whitehouse having withdrawn his name, Dr. Williams had a majority in both orders, but not a clear majority of clerical votes. On the third ballot, Dr. Seabury's name having been withdrawn, and that of Bishop Southgate substituted, Bishop Southgate had a clear majority of clerical, and Dr. Williams a clear majority of lay votes, so that by reason of non-concurrence there was no election. The same result attended the fourth and fifth ballots. On Friday, Bishop Southgate having been withdrawn, and Dr. Creighton substituted, after a long conference between the two parties, two more ballots were taken, on both of which Dr. Creighton had the majority of the clerical, and Dr. Williams of the lay votes. After the seventh ballot it was acknowledged that an election was impossible, and a motion for adjournment, *sine die*, was proposed and carried by a majority of 119 clergy, and 103 laity, against 45 clergy, and 50 laity.

While the business of balloting was in progress, a motion was made, and after much discussion, and several unsuccessful amendments, carried, for the payment to the provisional bishop to be elected of the surplus of the Episcopal Fund over and above the 2500 dollars paid annually to Bishop Onderdonk.

An attempt to revive the claim of the coloured congregation of St. Philip's for admission into the Union was likewise unsuccessful.



# INDEX

OF

## BOOKS REVIEWED.

\*\*\* For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

- Aiken—War, Religiously, Morally, and Historically considered.* By P. T. Aiken, Advocate, 447.
- Alison—Essays, Political, Historical, and Miscellaneous, Vol. III.* By Archibald Alison, LL.D., 206.
- Arctic Expeditions—A Lecture.* By Mr. Weld, 475.
- Arnold—Homer's Iliad, Books I—IV., with Critical Introduction, and copious English Notes.* By the Rev. T. K. Arnold, 204.
- Articles, Catechism on the Thirty-nine.* By the Rev. J. Beaven, D.D., 474.
- Barrington—The Child's Preacher; or the Gospel taught to Children in simple language.* By the Hon. and Rev. L. Barrington, 220.
- Bather—Sermons on Old Testament Histories.* Selected from the Parish Discourses of the late Archdeacon, 472.
- Beames—Abuse of Oaths.* By Mr. Beames, 476.
- Beaven—Catechism on the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.* By the Rev. J. Beaven, D.D., 474.
- Beke—An Inquiry into M. D'Abbadie's Journey to Kaffa.* By Dr. Beke, 476.
- Benson—Christian Liberty.* By Rev. Canon Benson, 476.
- Besly—"One Lord, one Faith." Discourses, Doctrinal and Occasional.* By John Besly, D.C.L., 214.
- Bible of Every Land, the,* 476.
- Bible, the Blank-paged,* 476.
- Bowden—Life and Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh.* By John William Bowden, 38.
- Bowyer—The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the New Hierarchy.* By George Bowyer, D.C.L., 410.
- Brecon, Record of the College of Christ-Church in.* By the Rev. Jermyn Pratt, 211.
- Bremer—The Midnight Sun; a Pilgrimage.* By Frederica Bremer. Translated by Mary Howitt, 196.
- Browne—An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, Historical and Doctrinal.* By the Rev. E. Harold Browne, 472.
- Browning—Christmas Eve and Easter Day; a Poem.* By Robert Browning, 65.
- Browning—Poems by Elizabeth Barrett Browning,* 320.
- Burnett—The Philosophy of Spirits in relation to Matter.* By C. M. Burnett, 463.
- Butler—The Old Paths of the Church of England; a Sermon.* By the Rev. Daniel Butler, 473.
- Calvert—The Merit and Tendencies of Free-Trade and Protection.* By Dr. Calvert, 476.
- Canterbury Papers—Information concerning the principles, &c., of the Founders of the Settlement of Canterbury in New Zealand,* 213.
- Cassels—Eidolon, or the Course of a Soul; and other Poems.* By Walter Cassels, 469.
- Changes of our Times, the; or, the History of John Gray of Willoughby,* 220.
- Chesney—Expedition for the Survey of the Rivers Euphrates and Tigris.* By Lieut.-Col. Chesney, 13.
- Christian Church—Narrative of Events affecting the Position and Prospects of the whole,* 122 and 265.
- Christian Year, the,* 474.
- Christmas, Old,* 474.
- Churchman's Diary, the; an Almanack for the Year of Grace 1851,* 466.
- Church Review and Ecclesiastical Register, the,* 476.
- Clark—Hungary and the Hungarian Struggle.* By T. Grieve Clark, 1.
- Collingwood—The Church, Apostolic, Primitive, and Anglican: Sermons,* by the Rev. J. Collingwood, 192.
- Conchology, an Introduction to; or Elements of the Natural History of Molluscos Animals.* By George Johnston, M.D., 198.
- Cornish—A Selection of Psalms and Hymns.* By the Rev. H. K. Cornish, 162.

- Cornish—Selection of Sermons and Poetical Remains.* By the Rev. G. J. Cornish, 472.
- Croly—The Theory of Baptism. The Regeneration of Infants Vindicated on the Testimony of Holy Scripture, Christian Antiquity, and the Church of England.* By George Croly, LL.D., 457.
- Crabbe—Posthumous Sermons.* By the Rev. G. Crabbe. Edited by the Rev. J. D. Hastings, 204.
- Cust—Family Reading. The New Testament Narrative Harmonized and Explained.* Compiled from various Authors. By the Hon. Sir Edward Cust, 196.
- Daily Steps towards Heaven,* 451.
- Denison—Appeal to the Clergy and Laity of the Church to Combine for her Defence, and the Recovery of her Rights and Liberties.* By the Rev. G. Anthony Denison, 98.
- Dialogue between Joseph Smith and the Devil,* 122 and 265.
- Drury—Eastbury; a Tale.* By Anna Harriet Drury, 475.
- Eastbury; a Tale.* By Anna Harriet Drury, 475.
- Eastern Church—A History of the Holy Eastern Church. Part I.* By the Rev. J. M. Neale, 458.
- Eastern Churches—Containing Sketches of the Nestorian, Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian Communities.* By the Author of "Proposals for Christian Union," 206.
- Eddrup—Sermon on Papal Aggression.* By Mr. Eddrup, 476.
- Edge—Letter to the Right Hon. Lord Ashley on the Alleged Romish Tendency of the Younger Clergy.* By the Rev. W. J. Edge, 467.
- Edmonstone—A Letter to the Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway on the Present Aspect of Church Affairs.* By Sir A. Edmonstone, Bart., 201.
- Edmonstone—The Christian Gentleman's Daily Walk.* By Sir Archibald Edmonstone, Bart., 215.
- Eidolon, or the Course of a Soul, and other Poems.* By Walter Cassels, 469.
- Fides Laici,* 201.
- Fitzgerald—ΘΗΚΩΝ ΑΡΕΤΩΝ ΥΠΟ-ΤΥΠΩΣΙΣ. A Selection from the Nichomachean Ethics of Aristotle.* By William Fitzgerald, M.A., 199.
- Forbes—A Physician's Holiday; or a Month in Switzerland in the Summer of 1848.* By John Forbes, M.D., 176.
- Fortescue—The Tudor Supremacy in Jurisdiction unlimited. A Sermon,* by the Rev. R. H. Fortescue, 202.
- The Four Gospels combined,* 447.
- Freeman—Remarks on the Architecture of Llandaff Cathedral.* By Edward A. Freeman, 461.
- Gray—Emperors of Rome, from Augustine to Constantine.* By Mrs. Hamilton Gray, 211.
- Gurney—The Danger and the Foe. A Sermon,* by the Rev. Archer Gurney, 473.
- Gurney—Union and Victory. A Sermon,* by the Rev. Archer Gurney, 473.
- Harington—The Bull of Pope Pius IX. and the Ancient British Church.* By Chancellor Harington, 410 and 476.
- Harington—The Reformers of the Anglican Church and Mr. Macaulay's History of England.* By Chancellor Harington, 307.
- Hastings—Posthumous Sermons,* by the Rev. G. Crabbe. Edited by the Rev. J. D. Hastings, 204.
- Hawkins—Stand Fast in the Faith.* By the Rev. Ernest Hawkins, 476.
- Heurtley—Parochial Sermons preached in a Village Church.* By the Rev. C. A. Heurtley, 196.
- Heygate—The Wedding Gift; a Devotional Manual for the Married.* By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, 451.
- Hilton—Sermon on the Papal Aggression.* By the Rev. H. D. Hilton, 476.
- Horstius—The Paradise of the Christian Soul.* By James Merlo Horstius, 205.
- Hudleston—Sermons,* by the Rev. Andrew Hudleston, D.D., 200.
- Hulbert—Ordination, Matrimony, Vectigalia, and Extreme Unction, theologically considered.* By the Rev. D. P. M. Hulbert, 460.
- Hungary and the Hungarian Struggle.* By Thomas Grieve Clark, 1.
- Hungary—Memoirs of the War of Independence in.* By General Klapka. Translated by Otto Wenckstern, 1.
- In Memoriam,* 65.
- Jackson—Rome and her Claims.* By Rev. J. Jackson, 476.
- Jameson—Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts.* By Mrs. Jameson, 205 and 462.

- Jewel*—*The Works of John Jewel, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury.* Edited by Dr. Jelf, 334.
- Johnston*—*An Introduction to Conchology; or Elements of the Natural History of Molluscous Animals.* By George Johnston, M.D., 198.
- Jones*—*Tracts on the Church.* By the Rev. William Jones, 214.
- Knox*—*Game Birds and Wild Fowl; their Friends and Foes.* By A. E. Knox, M.A., 431.
- Latter-Day Saints, Proclamation of the Twelve Apostles of the,* 122 and 265.
- Lindsay*—*A Brief Analysis of the Doctrine and Argument in the Case of Gorham v. the Bishop of Exeter.* By Lord Lindsay, 216.
- Llandaff Cathedral, Remarks on the Architecture of.* By E. A. Freeman, 461.
- Lowe*—*The Prophecy of Balaam and other Poems.* By Helen Lowe, 320.
- Lyrics, a Score of,* 461.
- Lyle*—*Remains of the late Rev. H. F. Lyle,* 465.
- Macaulay's History of England, and the Reformers of the Anglican Church.* By Chancellor Harington, 307.
- Mant*—*The Book of Common Prayer, with Notes,* by Bishop Mant, 451.
- Marriott*—*Sermons preached in Bradfield Church.* By the Rev. C. Marriott, 194.
- Marsland*—*Regeneration; or, Divine and Human Nature. A Poem in six books.* By George Marsland, 206.
- Mayow*—*A Second Letter to the Rev. W. Maskell.* By the Rev. Mayow-Wynell-Mayow, 176.
- Miller*—*A Safe Path for Humble Churchmen: Six Sermons on the Church Catechism.* By the Rev. John Miller, 215.
- Molesworth*—*Education: a Sermon,* by Dr. Molesworth, 476.
- Montgomery*—*God and Man. Outlines of Religious and Moral Truth according to Scripture and the Church.* By the Rev. R. Montgomery, 150.
- Moody*—*The New Testament Expounded and Illustrated according to the usual Marginal References, in the very Words of Holy Scripture.* By Clement Moody, M.A., 473.
- Mormonism, Friendly Warnings on the Subject of, Addressed to his Parishioners,* by a Country Clergyman, 122 and 265.
- Neale*—*A History of the Holy Eastern Church. Part I.* By the Rev. J. M. Neale, 458.
- Neale*—*A Letter to Archdeacon Hare with respect to his Pamphlet on the Gorham Question.* By the Rev. J. M. Neale, 210.
- Neale*—*Readings for the Aged.* By the Rev. J. M. Neale, 464.
- Neander*—*Light in the Dark Places; or, Memorials of Christian Life in the Middle Ages.* Translated from the German of the late Aug. Neander, 446.
- O'Brien*—*A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the United Diocese of Ossory, Fern, and Leighlin, in October, 1848.* By Bishop O'Brien, 207.
- Parish Musings in Verse.* By John S. B. Monsell, 201.
- Phillips*—*The Life of James Davis, a Village Schoolmaster.* Written by Sir Thomas Phillips, 472.
- Phipps*—*A Catechism on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.* By the Rev. E. J. Phipps, 451.
- Pinder*—*Sermons for the Holy Days observed in the Church of England.* By the Rev. J. H. Pinder, M.A., 445.
- Poor Artist, the; or Seven Eye-Sights and One Object,* 211.
- Pratt, Orson*—*Absurdities of Immaterialism.* By Orson Pratt, 122 and 265.
- Pratt, Orson*—*Divine Authority; or, "Was Joseph Smith sent of God?"* By Orson Pratt, 122 and 265.
- Pratt*—*Record of the College of Christ Church in Brecon.* By the Rev. Jermyn Pratt, 211.
- Rawstorne*—*Five Sermons preached at Galby.* By Mr. Rawstorne, 476.
- Reflections of the Past and Shadows of the Future. A Book for the New Year,* 456.
- Relton*—*Plain Lectures on Romanism.* By Rev. E. W. Relton, 476.
- Revelation of Jesus Christ, the; explained agreeably to the Analogy of the Holy Scripture.* By a Clergyman, 467.
- Roberts*—*The Life, Letters, and Opinions of William Roberts, Esq.* Edited by his Son, Arthur Roberts, M.A., 199.
- Robinson*—*Leisure Hours in a Country Parsonage; or Strictures on Men, Manners, and Books.* By the Rev. J. K. Robinson, 463.
- Robinson*—*The Church and the People.* By the Rev. Chr. Robinson, 462.



- Schleiermacher*—*Brief Outline of the Study of Theology.* By the late Dr. F. Schleiermacher. With Reminiscences of Schleiermacher, by Dr. F. Lücke. Translated from the German, by William Farrer, 452.
- Scotland, Lives of the Queens of.* By Agnes Strickland, 245.
- Shirley—Letters to Young People.* By the late Bishop Shirley, 463.
- Sickness, its Trials and Blessings,* 214.
- Smith—An Inquiry into the Catholic Truths hidden under certain Articles of the Church of Rome. Part II. Original Sin and Justification.* By Charles Smith, B.D., 213.
- Spencer, Orson—Letters Exhibiting the Doctrines of the Latter-Day Saints.* By Orson Spencer, A.B., 122 and 265.
- St. George for England! An Address to, and Correspondence with, certain Persons Disaffected to the Established Constitution.* By a Member of the English Bar, 204.
- Stretton—Church Hymns.* Compiled by the Rev. Henry Stretton, 213.
- Strickland—Lives of the Queens of Scotland.* By Agnes Strickland, 245.
- Tales and Allegories,* 474
- Thompson—An Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of Wealth.* By W. Thompson. A new Edition by William Pace, 446.
- Tomlins—Sermons.* By the Rev. Richard Tomlins, 220.
- Townsend—Journal of a Tour in Italy in 1850, with an Account of an Interview with the Pope at the Vatican.* By the Rev. George Townsend, D.D., 444.
- Turner—The Life of Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury.* Translated from the German of Hasse. By the Rev. W. Turner, 38.
- Testimony, the,* 122 and 265.
- Taylor—The Virgin Widow; a Play.* By Henry Taylor, 65.
- Wade—Sermon on the Papal-Aggression.* By the Rev. Nugent Wade, 476.
- War, Religiously, Morally, and Historically considered.* By P. T. Aiken, 447.
- Watson—The Church's own Action. A Sermon.* By Rev. — Watson, 476.
- Wealth, an Inquiry into the Principles of the Distribution of.* By W. Thompson. Edited by W. Pace, 446.
- Wedding Gift, the.* By the Rev. W. E. Heygate, 451.
- Weld—"Arctic Expeditions." A Lecture.* By Mr. Weld, 475.
- Wickham—A Synopsis of the Doctrine of Baptism, Regeneration, and Conversion, by the Fathers of the Church up to the end of the Fourth Century.* By J. A. Wickham. With a Preface, by the Rev. D. Wickham, 197.
- Williams—Letter to the Bishop of Llandaff on the Peculiar Condition and Wants of the Diocese.* By Thomas Williams, 461.
- Wilson—Rig-Veda-Sanhita. A Collection of Ancient Hindu Hymns.* Translated from the Sanskrit. By H. H. Wilson, 210.
- Wilson—Sacra Privata. The Private Meditations, Devotions, and Prayers, of Bishop Wilson,* 220.
- Wiseman—An Appeal to the English People on the Subject of the Catholic Hierarchy.* By Cardinal Wiseman, 410.
- Wordsworth—Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Book of Revelation?* By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., 465.
- Wordsworth—Diotrephes and St. John: on the Claim of the Bishop of Rome to Exercise Jurisdiction in England.* By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., 410.
- Wray—Congregational Independents, an Inquiry into Faith and Practice.* By Rev. H. Wray, 476.
- Wynter—Church Colonization.* By Rev. J. Cecil Wynter, 476.
- Wynter—Discourses on Colonization and Education.* By Mr. Wynter, 476.
- Zareefa; a Tale, and other Poems,* 320.

# INDEX

## OF THE

### REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

---

*Anselm*, life of, by Professor Hasse, of Berlin, translated by Rev. W. Turner; extract describing the union of Church and State at the time of Charlemagne, 43.

*Berkeley*, Bishop of Cloyne, his Exhortation to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, 405.

*Brecon*, Rev. Mr. Pratt's account of the disgraceful state of the Collegiate Church at, 211, 212.

*Canterbury Settlement*, the endowment and right of Appointment of the Bishop, 213.

*Cassels*, Mr., his Poem of Eidolon, an imitation of Tennyson and Mrs. Browning, 469, and of Keats, 470, 471.

*Catechism*, its power as a sound Christian manual, from its fulness of matter in a small compass, 215; the three last Articles of the Apostles' Creed, 216.

*Chesney's*, Colonel, his Survey of the River Euphrates, 13; to determine the best line of communication between Europe and India, 14, 15; King William IV.'s interest in the expedition, 16; the Duke of Wellington's orders, 17; the advantages of the proposed line of route, 18; the contents of this work, 19, 20; full of interest to the Biblical Student, 21, 22; the Water Course of Asia, 23; the Tigris, 24; the Euphrates, 25; ruins of Al-Kādhir, 26; the Site of the Garden of Eden in Armenia, 27—30; remains of Halebi and Antioch, 31; architectural remains in Mesopotamia and Assyria, 32, 33; ruins of Persepolis, 34; the navigation of the Euphrates, 35—37.

*Church, the*, her Right to Spiritual Jurisdiction unfettered by the Crown, ably argued by Rev. R. H. Fortescue, 202, 203.

*Church and State in the Twelfth Century and the Nineteenth*, 38; closely united

during the former period, 39; the encroachments of the Civil Power in modern times, 40, 41; history of the Western Church from the time of Charlemagne, 42; as described by Professor Hasse of Berlin, in his *Life of Anselm*, 43, 44; the Corruption of the Church in the tenth century, 45; its frightful secularization, 46, 47; men submitted to these abuses then as now, 48, 49; a party in the Church sought an alteration in the relations of Church and State, 50; Gregory VI. asserts the right of the clergy and people to elect the Pope, 51; is joined in this by Hildebrand, 52; who succeeds to the Papacy, 53; the State loses its ancient rights, 54; the Royal Supremacy in England in the eleventh century, 55, 56; sketches of the then Episcopate, 57; their conduct as courtiers and politicians, 58, 59; compared with the position now occupied by the Church of England, 60; divisions in the Church and in the State, 61, 62; lawfulness of Church Unions and other organizations for the restoration of the Church's rights, 63, 64.

*Church Emancipation* needed, 93; absolute Sovereignty of the Legislature, 94; but most unjust in its interference, 95; an untrue assertion that the State endowed the Church, 96; crying injustice I., of the existing Law of Episcopal Appointments, 97—99; II., of the decision of Doctrinal cases by the Privy Council, 100; III., of the hindrances to the discipline and expansion of the Church, 101, 102; freedom equal to those of Dissenters due to her, 103; answers to objections, 104; the Supremacy of the Crown, 105, 106; Synods, 107; meaning of Church Emancipation, 108; the conduct of the Evangelical party, 109; misrepresentation to be expected, 110;

- how the cause of the Church is to be advocated, 111; and the people influenced, 112; Mr. Denison on the Gorham Case, 113; the silence of the bishops, 114; the alternatives now before the Church, 115, 116; "agitation" and combination necessary, 117, 118; collections for the Church Unions, 119, 120; declaration of firm faith in the Church of England, 121.
- Collingwood*, the Rev. J., his Sermons—the Church Apostolic, Primitive, and Anglican, 192; on the Royal Supremacy, 193.
- Convention of the American Church*, Triennial Meeting of, in 1850, 477—500.
- Croly*, Rev. Dr., his remarks on the evils attending such a mixed tribunal as the Privy Council, 457; and on the mischief done by all disloyal members of the Church, 458.
- Cust*, Sir Edward, his "Family Reading," the New Testament harmonised and explained, 196, 197.
- Drury*, Anna Harriet, her tale of Eastbury, 475.
- Eastern Church*, Mr. Neale's Researches on the Geography, Antiquities, Architecture, &c., of the, 459.
- Game Birds and Wild Fowl*, their Friends and their Foes—by A. E. Knox, 431; field sports not condemned, 431; but the Game Laws full of evil, 432, 433; the falcon kills its victim with the hind talon, 434; the rate and distance of the flight of birds, 435; falcons susceptible of personal attachment, 436, 437; the rearing of pheasants, 438, 439; their ingenuity in evading discovery, 440; anecdote of fish frozen by cold, 441; an Irish Woodcock Battue, 442, 443.
- Gorham Case*, Lord Lindsay's analysis of the doctrine and arguments in the, 216; and its bearing on the Church, 217.
- Hulbert*, Rev. Mr., his modest appreciation of the importance of his writings, 460.
- Hungary*, *Memoirs of the War of Independence in*—by General Klapka—translated by Otto Wenckstern, 1; dread of democratic violence prevented England's interference, 2; mutual relations of Hungary and Austria, 3; superiority of Hungarian aristocracy, 4, 5; Austrian enmity to the Hungarian Constitution, 6, 7; they excite the Croatian against the Magyars, 8, 9; who proclaims a Republic under Kossuth, 10, 11; future prospects for the Magyar race, 11; Mr. Clark's and Klapka's books on Hungary, 12.
- Jewel's* [Bishop] *Works* (Dr. Jelf's edition), 334; appreciated by Divines of the 17th century, 335, 336; date of the two controversies, 337—339; defended from the charge of favouring Puritanism, 340; his desire for peaceful worship, 341, 342; sketch of his life, 343; at Oxford, 344—348; ejected, 349, 350; his recantation, 351, 352; confesses his sin, 353; in exile, 354, 355; controversy on Church discipline, 356, 357; return to England, 358; appointed commissioner, 359, 360; contentions about dress and ceremonies, 361; consecrated Bishop of Salisbury, 362, 363; his sermon at Paul's Cross, 364; his "Apologia Ecclesie Anglicana," 365—367; his letters, 368; controversy with Harding, 369—373; created D.D., 374; travelling preachers appointed, 375, 376; his letter to Bullinger, 377; and others, 378, 379; his opinions on usury, 380; his indignation against the Bull of Pius V., 381—383; his anxieties about Puritanism, 384; his last days, 385—388; his character considered as a scholar and Divine, 389, 390; as a bishop, 391; his acquaintance with Hooker, 392, 393; he rebukes Queen Elizabeth for pillaging the Church, 394, 395; his sermons, 396, 397; his lost MSS., 398; warnings against Romanism, 399; the Papal Supremacy, 400; diplomatic relations with Rome, 401, 402; unity sought in vain in Rome, 403, 404; Romanism in Ireland, 405; Bishop Jewel's "View of a Seditious Bull," 407, 408; Dr. Jelf's "List of Authors and Editors," 409.
- Lindsay*, Lord, his remarks on the beneficial effects of the High and Low Church Parties in the Church of England, 217; on the Gorham Case, 218; on secessions from the Church, 219.
- Liturgies of the Easter*, Mr. Neale's researches on the, 459.
- London*, Bishop of, his letter to the Rev. R. T. Lowe on his conduct to the Bishop of Bombay, 234.
- Loyalty* to the Church, and heartiness necessary to those who fight her battles, 201.



- Lücke*, Dr., his account of the origin of the design of uniting the Lutheran and Reformed in one communion, 452; Schleiermacher's labours in this cause, 453, 454; discussions on the Prussian Liturgy, 455, 456.
- Lyte*, the Rev. H. F., his Memoir and Poems, 465.
- Macaulay's History of England*, 307; his Romanism, 308; he charges the founders of the Anglican Church with the denial of Episcopacy, 309; disproved by the Ordinal, 310; and Cranmer, 311—313; "his commission," 314—317; and Bishop Ridley, &c., 318, 319.
- Marriott*, Rev. C., his sermon on "Vengeance is for God," 194; on "Baptismal Regeneration," 195; on the "Pharisee and Publican," 196.
- Marsland*, Mr., extract from his poem, and criticisms on the Established Churches, 206, 207.
- Mayow*, the Rev. M. W., his second letter to Mr. Maskell, 186; discusses the authority of the judgment of the Privy Council, 187, 188; the dogmatic teaching of the English Church, 189, 190; secessions from the Church contemplated, 191, 192.
- Mollusca*, explanation of the term, by George Johnston, M.D., 198.
- Neale*, Rev. W., his researches on the Holy Eastern Churches, 458.
- North Carolina*, address of the bishop of, in refutation of the charge of Romanism, 237—240.
- O'Brien*, Bishop, extract from his charge on the removal of all legal disabilities from Romanists and Dissenters, 207—209.
- Papal Aggression*, the, 410; openly proposed by the Romanists long ago, 411; without remonstrance from the Government, 412, 413; the Synod of Thurles an infringement of the Royal Supremacy, 414—416; as also the new Romish Hierarchy, 417—420; injurious to the security of the Church of England, 421, 422; general hostility to "Tractarianism," 423, 424; probable measure for purging the Church of Romanizing practices, 425, 426; Convocation the true remedy, 427; or by reference to the Episcopate, 428; the Church a prey to the struggles of parties, 429; the increase of Rationalism, 430.
- Patriotism*, maxims concerning, by George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne, 405.
- Physician's Holiday*, A, by Dr. Forbes, 176; different scenes of attraction, 177, 178; a course of travelling recommended, 179; the dietary, 180, 181; description of the *Mer de Glace*, 182, 183; of an avalanche, 184; recent ecclesiastical reforms in Piedmont, 185, 186.
- Poetesses*, 320; L. E. L. and Mrs. Hemans, 321; foreign poetesses, 322; Mrs. Browning and Miss Lowe, 323, 324; the "Drama of Exile," 325; the "Seraphim," 326, 327; the "Vision of Poets," and other lyrics, 328—332; Miss Lowe's Poems, 333.
- Poetry of Tennyson, Browning, and Taylor*, 65; criticisms of the Press, 66, 67; Tennyson and his imitators, 68—70; "In Memoriam," 71, 72; its scepticism, or indifference, 73—76; he spoke from and to the heart, 77, 78; the poet's apology, 79; his high appreciation of his friend, 80, 81; his exquisite pathos and tenderness, 82, 83; Robert Browning's "Christmas Eve and Easter Day," 84; description of a Meeting House, 85; St. Peter's at Rome, 86; a Lecture Hall in Germany, 87, 88; description of the Last Day, 89; Taylor's "Virgin Widow," 90; his "Statesman," a most mischievous book, 91, 92.
- Privy Council*, Dr. Croly's remarks on the evils attending such a mixed tribunal as the, 457.
- Prussian Liturgy*, discussions relative to the, 455, 456.
- Romanists*, *Schism among the*, in the United States, 244.
- Romish Missions*, the character of, 230.
- Romish tendency*, the younger Clergy defended from the charge of having a, by Rev. W. J. Edge, 468.
- Saviour*, Rev. Dr. Hudleston's sermon on the name and office of, 200.
- Schleiermacher*, Dr. Friedrich, his labours to effect the union of the Lutheran and Reformed in one communion, 453; the origin of the design, 452.
- Spiritual Gifts and Spiritual Delusions*, 122; birth of Mormonism and Irvingism, 123; secrecy observed about Irvingite records, 124; they pretend to a new Revelation, 125; in consequence of the

"falling away of the baptized," 126—128; and the cessation of the apostolic and prophetic offices, 129, 130; lamentation over the present state of Christendom, 131; similar denunciations of the Mormonites, 132—134; their blasphemous language, 135; teach us to maintain the independence of the Church, and make a firm stand against Schism, 136, 137; Irvingites announced a new dispensation in 1835, 138, 139; the "Divisions of the Tribes," 140; the "Testimony" prepared as their Text Book, 141; abstract of its contents, 142—144; the first rise of Irvingism, 145; constituted as a distinct body, 146; disclaims Schism, 147; their general appeal, 148, 149.

*Spiritual Gifts and Spiritual Delusions*, 265, 266; Mormonite proclamation, 267—270; similar to that of the Irvingites, 271; Mormonism demands the restoration of the fourfold ministry of the Apostles, 272, 273; so also Irvingism, 274—276; both assert the proof of miracles to their claims, 277; the Irvingites speak depreciatingly of the evidence of miracles, 278; Irving himself doubted of the work on his death-bed, 279, 280; "apostles" called and the call revoked, 281—283; misgivings of some of the "apostles," 284, 285; the evidence of the Mormonites' apostleship, 286, 287; their miracles, 288—291; and doctrine on the Trinity, 292, 293; alleged extinction of the Christian Church, 294—297; they assert that "Immaterialists are Atheists," 298—300; a summary of the Mormonist Creed, 301—303; Mormonism and Irvingism, the results of faintness of faith in the operation of God the Holy Ghost, 304—306.

*Strickland's Lives of the Queens of Scotland*, 245; general design of the work, 246, 247; life of Margaret Tudor, 248; marries James IV. of Scotland, 249; her reception in Scotland, 250—252; becomes a mother, 253; and a widow after the battle of Flodden, 254, 255; marries the Earl of Angus, and made

Regent, 256; deposed, 257; obtains a divorce and marries again, 258, 259; life of Magdalene of France, 260—262; marries James V. of Scotland, 263; her death, 264.

*Theocracy*, the personal character of God popularly resolved into impersonal properties and abstruse terms, 150, 151; He is the Truth Himself, 152; He is the only Lawgiver, 153; He is Power, the King of kings, 154; Omnipresent, 155; these truths eloquently taught by the Rev. Robert Montgomery in his "God and Man," 155; the errors of the age inconsistent with a due realization of these truths, 156; as, the right of private interpretation of the Bible, 157, 158; or the doctrine of development, 159; or the appeal to expediency and public opinion, 160, 161; cold, dry, inadequate terms of speaking on this subject, prevalent, 162, 163; the visible creation but the outward manifestation of the invisible God, 164; the source forgotten in the means of grace, 165; He is ignored as the sole Monarch of the Universe, 166; the principles of our Constitution theocratic, 167; forgotten by our modern legislators, 168, 169; in the relation of children to parents, servants to masters, 170; and in the pastoral relation, 171; summary of theocratic principles, 172, 173; the cause of their rejection and denial amongst us now, 174, 175.

*Townsend*, Rev. Dr., his interview with Cardinal Mai at Rome, 443.

*War, Defensive*, defended by Mr. Aiken, 447; the character of soldiers vindicated by illustrious examples, 448; the cost of standing armies, 449; British gallantry, 450.

"*Westward, Ho!*" a Lyric, extract from, 464.

*Wickham*, J. A., his examination of the opinions held in different ages on the subject of Baptism, 197.















UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 076144416